



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 6, 2013

No. 62

## House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BENTIVOLIO).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
May 6, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable KERRY BENTIVOLIO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2013, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes each, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

### BANGLADESH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, more than a thousand workers have died from working in Bangladesh's garment industry.

In the latest tragedy, an eight-story building called Rana Plaza collapsed. It housed five garment factories. It has killed more than 650 workers so far, injured more than a thousand, with still more buried in the rubble. This stag-

gering body count occurred just 5 months after the Tazreen factory fire that killed at least 112 workers. Forty more incidents, including explosions and fires, causing death and injury, have taken place since the Tazreen factory fire.

I met with one of the Tazreen survivors when she visited Washington last month. She described the outrageous working conditions leading up to the fire. She toiled in a factory with bars on the windows and no place to run if a fire broke out. She told me how she jumped from the third floor of the burning factory to save her body from the fire so her family could recognize her in case of her death, and many of her coworkers jumped with her, but did not survive the fall. During our meeting, it became clear that it was only a matter of time before the next Tazreen would take place.

Two weeks later, Rana Plaza collapsed.

Unfortunately, these tragedies in Bangladesh are not isolated, and more of these tragedies, undoubtedly, will occur unless the major international corporations that keep these dangerous factories open decide to change their business practices. Clearly, there is a greater role for the U.S. and other governments to play, including the Bangladesh Government. However, the primary burden for action now lies with the major brands and retailers.

Let's remember what is at stake here: the lives of thousands of young women and mothers trying to scrape together an existence by working 12-hour shifts for pennies a garment.

They produce clothing under contract with corporations we all know well: Walmart, J. C. Penney, Mango, Benetton, H&M, The Children's Place, GAP, and Dress Barn, among others. The clothes these women sew in Bangladesh we buy here in America. Unfortunately, these young women are caught working in a garment industry

that pits supplier against supplier and country against country in a calculated race to the bottom.

Often, the margin for these corporations is subsistence wages and the needless disregard for the safety of these young women. That is the subsidy they receive—low wages and unsafe working conditions for the workers who produce these garments. Four million Bangladeshi workers in 5,000 factories provide clothing to Americans and to European brands while earning one of the lowest minimum wages in the world—about \$37 a month.

But they shouldn't have to risk their lives for the fashion industry's profits.

These young women are forced to work in factories with overtaxed electrical circuits, unenforced building codes, and premises without firefighting equipment and adequate exits, and in most cases, the exits are chained closed. Americans who are the consumers of these products are increasingly worried that the label "Made in Bangladesh" actually means "made in a death trap."

Why are the managers of these factories forcing these employees to work in these deplorable conditions? Because of fear—fear that the international brands and the retailers, which we know so well, will take their orders elsewhere because of a missed day of production, a late delivery, or a minuscule increase in production costs. The brands know this. That's why I believe they bear the ultimate responsibility for the horrendously unsafe working conditions in Bangladesh and elsewhere.

Corporate leaders in the fashion industry have a moral imperative to ensure that these tragedies do not happen again. These retailers and brands need to sign on to an enforceable agreement that will improve safety, called the Bangladesh Fire and Building Safety Agreement. It was developed by the Bangladeshi trade unions and non-governmental organizations to prevent

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H2407

these types of disasters from occurring by addressing the most urgent elements:

One, public reporting of all fire and building audits conducted by independent safety experts;

Two, mandates that factory owners make timely repairs;

Three, an obligation for the brands to terminate a contract if a factory defies its responsibility to keep workers safe;

Four, the right for workers to refuse unsafe work without retribution—to be able to refuse work without being fired, being penalized—and union access to factories, among other labor protections, so they can see for themselves what are the working conditions on any given day.

To make this work, these commitments must be contained in an enforceable contract between the brands and worker representatives because it is the workers' lives that are on the line. The holding companies of Calvin Klein, Tommy Hilfiger, Van Heusen, and IZOD have signed on to this agreement already, and a major German retailer has signed on as well. Others are now meeting in Europe to discuss its provisions.

I applaud these efforts toward corporate responsibility. It is now time for the major U.S. corporations, like GAP, Walmart, and J.C. Penney, to join them, but we must also take note and call out any attempt to water down the key provisions of this agreement. Experts believe that this safety agreement will only cost a dime per garment over 5 years in order to make a real difference in the safety of these factories—a dime for the lives of these workers.

The major global brands now face a choice. They can attempt to wait out the storm and go back to business as usual and continue their race to the bottom, or they can chart a different course that includes healthy profits, without a human death toll, by signing on to an enforceable safety agreement.

I hope these American and international fashion brands sign on. In the meantime, the American consumer and those who follow the fashion industry are watching. We want to see which fashion brands will accept blood on their labels and which will not.

#### COMMUNICATION FROM DIRECTOR OF CONSTITUENT SERVICES, THE HONORABLE ROBERT ADERHOLT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Jennifer Butler-Taylor, Director of Constituent Services, the Honorable ROBERT ADERHOLT, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 29, 2013.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,  
Speaker, House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules

of the House of Representatives that I have been served with a subpoena, issued by the Circuit Court for Cullman County, Alabama, for documents a civil case to which I am not a party.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I will determine whether compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and rights of the House.

Sincerely,

JENNIFER BUTLER-TAYLOR,  
Director of Constituent Services,  
U.S. Representative Robert Aderholt (AL-04).

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:  
We give You thanks, O God, for giving us another day.

We ask Your blessing upon this assembly and upon all to whom this authority of government is given. Help them to meet their responsibilities during these days, to attend to the immediate needs and concerns of the moment, enlightened by Your eternal Spirit.

The issues of the coming months remain complicated and divisive. Endow each Member with wisdom and equanimity, that productive solutions might be reached for the benefit of our Nation.

Please send Your Spirit of peace upon those areas of our world where violence and conflict endure and threaten to multiply. May all Your children learn to live in peace.

And may all that is done within the people's House this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FOXX led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### SAVANNAH RIVER SITE REPROGRAMMING SUCCESSFUL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, I was grateful to conduct a town hall in Aiken, South Carolina, where I listened to hundreds of constituents who are very concerned about the reprogramming request at the Savannah River site. Fortunately, over the weekend, the President's Office of Management and Budget sent the request to both Houses of Congress for approval.

This is a crucial step to end the 20 percent pay cut for 2,600 employees of Savannah River Nuclear Solutions. I appreciate the town hall participants: President Terra Carroll of the North Augusta Chamber of Commerce; Chairman Ronnie Young of the Aiken County Council; Aiken City Council members, Philip Merry and Dick Dewar; State Senator Tom Young, Jr.; President David Jameson of the Greater Aiken Chamber of Commerce; Vice Chancellor Joe Sobieralski of USC-Aiken; DHEC facilities liaison, Shelly Wilson; USC-Aiken student, Hannah McClure. And dedicated congressional staff Ted Felder, Sara Beaulieu, and Baker Elmore were instrumental for success.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

#### WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 30 years, government employees have had the option to choose paid time off or comp time in lieu of overtime pay. Private sector employees, however, haven't had that choice because Washington and an old 1938 labor law won't let them.

That isn't fair. When life happens in the form of school plays, Little League games, or family members becoming sick, time and flexibility are essential to working parents and grandparents. Money doesn't buy time. It would certainly help if every worker had the choice to receive comp time when they put in extra hours.

Government shouldn't be standing in the way. There are a lot of moms and a few grandmas in the Republican Conference, and we want a solution for American families. That solution is the Working Families Flexibility Act. Our legislation will ensure all workers, whether public or private, benefit from the flexibility of choices in overtime compensation.

# THE REMARKABLE RESILIENCE OF THE CITIZENS OF WEST, TEXAS

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, this past Friday, I visited the town of West, Texas, to see for myself how the investigation of the fertilizer plant explosion is proceeding. The town has suffered incredible losses, but I was impressed by the resilience of the people in West, and it is remarkable how the community has come together after that tragedy.

It is at the very beginning stages of collecting the facts and findings into how these events transpired. I have been working closely with the staff on the Energy and Commerce Committee who are looking into the voluminous material on the matter and will continue to oversee the Federal Government's response to this tragedy as the investigation unfolds.

I wanted to personally thank Assistant State Fire Marshal Kelly Kistner; the ATF agents who handled the Federal investigation; the FEMA coordinating officer, Kevin Hannes; and the district director for Congressman BILL FLORES, Timothy Head. I want to thank each of them for their service to our country and to the community of West. God bless our State.

## IMMIGRATION BILL OPPOSED

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, National Review and The Heritage Foundation both oppose the Senate immigration bill for many good reasons.

There is no deadline for secure borders, yet millions of illegal immigrants would be given amnesty 6 months after the bill is enacted. This would only encourage more illegal immigration.

The Senate immigration bill would double the already record 1 million legal immigrants admitted every year. Most Americans oppose this and instead want to make sure that current immigrants are assimilated.

The bill puts foreign workers ahead of the interests of American workers and the economic needs of our country.

Mr. Speaker, it is inconceivable that an immigration bill with these huge flaws would be approved.

## READ THE BILLS ACT

(Mr. BENTIVOLIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Read the Bills Act to provide transparency and accountability from all of us to our constituents.

Read the Bills would provide that Members of Congress and the public

have 1 week to review any bill and proposed amendments before voting on passage. It requires legislation be passed by rollcall, and it makes legislation easier to read by requiring that we show, in context, how bills would affect existing law.

It is a basic moral question that a Member of Congress should only vote to pass legislation having read and understood it. Every law affects how the American people live: who prospers and who suffers, who receives help and who is hurt, who is regulated and who benefits. We cannot pass laws without knowing what they do.

No legislation should be passed under cover of procedure. It is our duty to be transparent to our constituents, and I hope Members on both sides of the aisle will agree that this is an important step to rebuilding the trust between the American people and Congress.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1707

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

## VIETNAM VETERANS DONOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT ACT OF 2013

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 588) to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 588

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Vietnam Veterans Donor Acknowledgment Act of 2013".

### SEC. 2. DONOR CONTRIBUTION ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AT THE VIETNAM VETERANS MEMORIAL VISITOR CENTER.

Section 6(b) of Public Law 96-297 (16 U.S.C. 431 note) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (4) by striking the "and" after the semicolon;

(2) in paragraph (5) by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and

(3) by inserting at the end the following new paragraph:

"(6) notwithstanding section 8905(b)(7) of title 40, United States Code—

"(A) the Secretary of the Interior shall allow the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. to acknowledge donor contributions to the visitor center by displaying, inside the visitor center, an appropriate statement or credit acknowledging the contribution;

"(B) donor contribution acknowledgments shall be displayed in a form approved by the Secretary of the Interior and for a period of time commensurate with the level of the contribution and the life of the facility;

"(C) the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund shall bear all expenses related to the display of donor acknowledgments;

"(D) prior to the display of donor acknowledgments, the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. shall submit to the Secretary for approval, its plan for displaying donor acknowledgments;

"(E) such plan shall include the sample text and types of the acknowledgments or credits to be displayed and the form and location of all displays;

"(F) the Secretary shall approve the plan, if the Secretary determines that the plan—

"(i) allows only short, discrete, and unobtrusive acknowledgments or credits;

"(ii) does not permit any advertising slogans or company logos; and

"(iii) conforms to applicable National Park Service guidelines for indoor donor recognition; and

"(G) if the Secretary of the Interior determines that the proposed plan submitted under this paragraph, does not meet the requirements of this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

"(i) advise the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. not later than 30 days after receipt of the proposed plan of the reasons that such plan does not meet the requirements; and

"(ii) allow the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, Inc. to submit a revised donor recognition plan.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last year, Jan Scruggs, president of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund, came to my office and told me about an absurd fund-raising problem he had. He told me that in order to build a much-needed education center at the Vietnam Wall, he had to raise nearly \$100 million of private money. Normally, this would not be a big problem; however, in this case,

VVMF had to raise all of this \$100 million without the ability to recognize their donors because current law did not allow donor recognition.

Mr. Speaker, I think we can agree that it is ridiculous to force any organization to fund-raise without the ability to recognize donors. How are we supposed to raise any money? Even the National Park Service understands the importance of donor recognition. I personally have seen hundreds of benches in national parks all across this country that have little metal plaques on them thanking people for their generous donations.

In spite of current law and this donor recognition handicap, VVMF has raised over 25 percent of the nearly \$100 million needed to build this education center. My bill, H.R. 588, will give them the extra pulling power they need to quickly complete their fund-raising and finally cross the \$100 million finish line.

Overall, my bill is very straightforward. It merely provides VVMF the ability to recognize their donors. This recognition will lead to larger donations, a faster fund-raising pace, and quick and timely construction of the education center. It will also make the act of giving more personal and more rewarding. Put simply, every donor deserves a "thank you," and my bill will finally allow VVMF to give the "thank you" their donors so rightly deserve.

□ 1710

Also, in order to ensure that appropriate standards for donor recognition were met, I made sure that H.R. 588 dovetailed exactly with existing Parks Service guidelines. This regulatory overlap ensures that any donor recognition will be discreet, unobtrusive, and will not contain any advertising or company logos.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 588 is supported by numerous veterans' organizations, including the VFW, the American Gold Star Mothers, the Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America, and the Military Order of the Purple Heart, among many others. I urge my colleagues to support the quick passage this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GRIJALVA asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Congressman YOUNG for his work on this legislation, and I am very proud to be a cosponsor.

H.R. 588 allows the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Fund to acknowledge donor contributions to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center. The Memorial Fund has raised \$45 million in private funds and anticipates the cost of the center to be approximately \$85 million. This legislation is specific to the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center and deserves immediate attention.

I am hopeful that subcommittee Chairman BISHOP and I might explore

whether a broader amendment to the Commemorative Works Act, setting standards for donor acknowledgment for all memorials covered under the act, makes sense, but that project should not slow down this legislation.

Again, I thank Congressman YOUNG for his leadership, the leadership of the foundation, and others who have worked very hard on this issue for the past 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 588.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### BLACK HILLS CEMETERY ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 291) to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 291

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Black Hills Cemetery Act".

#### SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCES, CERTAIN CEMETERIES LOCATED IN BLACK HILLS NATIONAL FOREST, SOUTH DAKOTA.

(a) CEMETERY CONVEYANCES REQUIRED.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall convey, without consideration, to the local communities in South Dakota that are currently managing and maintaining certain community cemeteries (as specified in subsection (b)) all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to—

(1) the parcels of National Forest System land containing such cemeteries; and

(2) up to an additional two acres adjoining each cemetery in order to ensure the conveyances include unmarked gravesites and allow for expansion of the cemeteries.

(b) PROPERTY AND RECIPIENTS.—The properties to be conveyed under subsection (a), and the recipients of each property, are as follows:

(1) The Silver City Cemetery to the Silver City Volunteer Fire Department.

(2) The Hayward Cemetery to the Hayward Volunteer Fire Department.

(3) The encumbered land adjacent to the Englewood Cemetery (encompassing the cemetery entrance portal, access road, fences, 2,500 gallon reservoir and building housing such reservoir, and piping to provide sprinkling system to the cemetery) to the City of Lead.

(4) The land adjacent to the Mountain Meadow Cemetery to the Mountain Meadow Cemetery Association.

(5) The Roubaix Cemetery to the Roubaix Cemetery Association.

(6) The Nemo Cemetery to the Nemo Cemetery Association.

(7) The Galena Cemetery to the Galena Historical Society.

(8) The Rockerville Cemetery to the Rockerville Community Club.

(9) The Cold Springs Cemetery (including adjacent school yard and log building) to the Cold Springs Historical Society.

(c) CONDITION OF CONVEYANCE.—Each conveyance under subsection (a) shall be subject to the condition that the recipient accept the conveyed real property in its condition at the time of the conveyance.

(d) USE OF LAND CONVEYED.—The lands conveyed under subsection (a) shall continue to be used in the same manner and for the same purposes as they were immediately prior to their conveyance under this Act.

(e) DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY.—The exact acreage and legal description of each parcel of real property to be conveyed under subsection (a) shall be determined by surveys satisfactory to the Secretary. The cost of the survey for a particular parcel shall be borne by the recipient of such parcel.

(f) ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—The Secretary may require such additional terms and conditions in connection with the conveyances under subsection (a) as the Secretary considers appropriate to protect the interests of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from South Dakota (Mrs. NOEM), the author of the bill, to explain the bill.

Mrs. NOEM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his work on these important issues. I appreciate it.

Today I rise in support of H.R. 291, the Black Hills Cemetery Act. This bill is of great importance to the communities of the Black Hills area of South Dakota. The Black Hills of South Dakota are home to a number of historic cemeteries. Many of these originated in old mining towns dating back to the 1800s, and they have unique significance to the communities surrounding them. These include the Englewood, Galena, Hayward, Mountain Meadows, Roubaix, Nemo, Rockerville, Silver City, and the Cold Springs cemeteries.

These cemeteries are currently being managed by local cemetery associations and community groups in the

surrounding areas, but have been technically owned by the U.S. Forest Service since the 1900s. This causes unnecessary liability for the U.S. Forest Service because of the responsibility for upkeep and dealing with possible vandalism or damage to property in these cemeteries.

At almost no cost to taxpayers, the Black Hills Cemetery Act would simply transfer ownership of these cemeteries and up to 2 acres of adjacent land to the caretaking communities. They have managed them for generations under special use permits issued by the Forest Service. It also makes clear that these cemeteries will continue to be used for the same purpose as they always have been in the past.

I sponsored this bill at the request of these communities and the current caretakers of the cemeteries, and in consultation with the U.S. Forest Service. In fact, this bill was introduced and passed last year by the House with broad, bipartisan support. I look forward to seeing this bill pass again this year, and pass through the Senate this time so we can resolve this matter for the communities in South Dakota.

I would like to thank the communities and local residents for their help in working with my office and for advocating for this bill. I would also like to thank Chairmen HASTINGS and BISHOP and their staffs for pushing this bill forward for the second time. These communities have been asking for a solution to this situation for a number of years, and as their Representative, I'm glad that we have the opportunity to pass this bill again in the House today.

I want to thank Chairman YOUNG for his leadership as well, and I urge my colleagues to support and pass this bill for these communities in South Dakota.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 291 conveys cemeteries, currently on Forest Service lands, to communities in South Dakota. These local communities already manage and maintain these cemeteries and the legislation requires that these lands continue to be used for cemetery purposes. We have no objections to the legislation.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 291.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the yeas have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### PASCUA YAQUI TRIBE TRUST LAND ACT

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 507) to provide for the conveyance of certain inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 507

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Pascua Yaqui Tribe Trust Land Act".

#### SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For the purposes of this Act, the following definitions apply:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term "District" means the Tucson Unified School District, a school district recognized as such under the laws of the State of Arizona.

(2) MAP.—The term "map" means the map titled "PYT Land Department" and dated January 15, 2013.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(4) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, a federally recognized Indian tribe.

#### SEC. 3. LANDS TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) PARCEL A.—Subject to subsection (c) and to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 10 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as Parcel A are declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

(b) PARCEL B.—Subject to subsection (c) and valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the approximately 10 acres of Federal lands generally depicted on the map as Parcel B are declared to be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall take effect on the day after the date on which—

(1) the District relinquishes all right, title, and interest of the District in and to the land described in subsection (b); and

(2) the Secretary (or a delegate of the Secretary) approves and records the lease agreement between the Tribe and the District for the construction and operation of a regional transportation facility located on the restricted Indian land of the Tribe in accordance with the requirements of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the leasing of restricted Indian lands for public, religious, educational, recreational, residential, business, and other purposes requiring the grant of long-term leases", approved August 9, 1955 (25 U.S.C. 415), and part 162 of title 25, Code of Federal Regulations (including successor regulations).

#### SEC. 4. GAMING PROHIBITION.

The Tribe may not conduct gaming activities on the lands held in trust under this Act, as a matter of claimed inherent authority, or under the authority of any Federal law, including the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.) or under any regulations thereunder promulgated by the Secretary or the National Indian Gaming Commission.

#### SEC. 5. WATER RIGHTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall not be Federal reserved rights to surface water or groundwater for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(b) STATE WATER RIGHTS.—The Tribe retains any right or claim to water under State law for any land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act.

(c) FORFEITURE OR ABANDONMENT.—Any water rights that are appurtenant to land taken into trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under this Act may not be forfeited or abandoned.

(d) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this Act affects or modifies any right of the Tribe or any obligation of the United States under Public Law 95-375 (25 U.S.C. 1300f et seq.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alaska?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 507 directs the Secretary of the Interior to take two 10-acre parcels into trust for a tribe in Arizona. These two parcels are both completely surrounded by either the tribe's reservation or by fee lands owned by the tribe. Before the parcels can be taken into trust, however, the Tucson Unified School District will first need to relinquish its possessory interest in one parcel. The school district no longer needs the land, which it had previously received under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act.

The Secretary of the Interior will also need to approve a lease agreement between the tribe and the school district for the construction and operation of a regional transportation facility on the tribe's land.

Both parcels would be utilized as part of a golf course that is currently under construction. Neither parcel is necessary for the construction of the golf course, but if the tribe does not acquire and use these parcels, they will be orphaned and of relatively no use to either the tribe or to the United States.

As has become customary when taking land into trust, the bill includes language that prohibits any gaming on the two parcels to be taken into trust.

Finally, I would like to commend the gentleman from Arizona for his bill, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1720

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 507 is an important piece of legislation that will enable the Pascua Yaqui Tribe in my district in Arizona to consolidate its landholdings and remove two isolated, undeveloped parcels of land from the Bureau of Land Management responsibility.

The two 10-acre parcels are islands of "trapped" Federal land surrounded by Pascua Yaqui land on all sides. The tribe is developing a golf course in this area, and conveying these two parcels to the tribe will make managing the land easier for the tribe and the Federal Government.

Without this legislation, the tribe would have to design around the parcels, slowing down the project, weakening economic development that will benefit the entire Yaqui community. Passage of this bill will further the Federal Government's responsibility to enhance tribal trust resources.

I want to thank my colleagues and the leadership within the Natural Resources Committee for making this bill a priority for passage this session. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 507, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 507.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 588, H.R. 291, and H.R. 507, in each case by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## VIETNAM VETERANS DONOR ACKNOWLEDGMENT ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 588) to provide for donor contribution acknowledgments to be displayed at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial Visitor Center, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 398, nays 2, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—398

Aderholt  
Alexander  
Amodei  
Andrews  
Bachus  
Barber  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barrow (GA)  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Benishek  
Bentivolio  
Bera (CA)  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bonner  
Boustany  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Cassidy  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Chu  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble

Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Cotton  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Daines  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Duckworth  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Edwards  
Ellmers  
Engel  
Enyart  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farenthold  
Farr  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Fox  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge

Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Marino  
Garcia  
Gardner  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffin (AR)  
Griffith (VA)  
Grijalva  
Grimm  
Guthrie  
Hahn  
Hall  
Hanabusa  
Hanna  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings (WA)  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)

Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Guthrie  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Napolitano

Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Radel  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scaless  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz

Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

NAYS—2

Amash

Mulvaney

NOT VOTING—32

Bachmann  
Carter  
Cicilline  
Deutch  
Ellison  
Fattah  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Gutierrez  
Hastings (FL)

Herrera Beutler  
Jordan  
Kuster  
Lee (CA)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Markey  
McKeon  
Moran  
Nadler

Nunnelee  
Peters (MI)  
Richmond  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Speier  
Tiberi  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Westmoreland  
Wolf

□ 1856

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 129, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

### BLACK HILLS CEMETERY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 291) to provide for the conveyance of certain cemeteries that are located on National Forest System land in Black Hills National Forest, South Dakota, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 2, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 130]

YEAS—390

Aderholt	Clyburn	Franks (AZ)
Alexander	Coble	Frelinghuysen
Amodei	Coffman	Fudge
Andrews	Cohen	Gabbard
Bachus	Cole	Gallego
Barber	Collins (GA)	Garamendi
Barletta	Collins (NY)	Garcia
Barr	Conaway	Gardner
Barrow (GA)	Connolly	Garrett
Barton	Conyers	Gibbs
Beatty	Cook	Gibson
Becerra	Cooper	Gohmert
Benishek	Costa	Goodlatte
Bentivolio	Cotton	Gosar
Bera (CA)	Courtney	Gowdy
Bilirakis	Cramer	Granger
Bishop (GA)	Crawford	Graves (GA)
Bishop (NY)	Crenshaw	Grayson
Bishop (UT)	Crowley	Green, Al
Black	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Blackburn	Culberson	Griffin (AR)
Blumenauer	Cummings	Griffith (VA)
Bonamici	Daines	Grijalva
Bonner	Davis (CA)	Guthrie
Boustany	Davis, Danny	Hahn
Brady (PA)	Davis, Rodney	Hall
Brady (TX)	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Hanna
Bridenstine	Delaney	Harper
Brooks (AL)	DeLauro	Harris
Brooks (IN)	DelBene	Hartzler
Broun (GA)	Dent	Hastings (WA)
Brown (FL)	DeSantis	Heck (NV)
Brownley (CA)	DesJarlais	Heck (WA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Hensarling
Bucshon	Dingell	Herrera Beutler
Burgess	Doggett	Higgins
Bustos	Doyle	Himes
Butterfield	Duckworth	Holding
Calvert	Duffy	Holt
Camp	Duncan (SC)	Honda
Campbell	Duncan (TN)	Horsford
Cantor	Edwards	Hoyer
Capito	Ellmers	Hudson
Capps	Engel	Huelskamp
Capuano	Enyart	Huffman
Cárdenas	Eshoo	Huizenga (MI)
Carney	Esty	Hultgren
Carson (IN)	Farenthold	Hunter
Carter	Farr	Hurt
Cartwright	Fincher	Israel
Cassidy	Fitzpatrick	Issa
Castor (FL)	Fleischmann	Jackson Lee
Chabot	Fleming	Jeffries
Chaffetz	Flores	Jenkins
Chu	Forbes	Johnson (GA)
Cicilline	Fortenberry	Johnson (OH)
Clarke	Foster	Johnson, E. B.
Clay	Fox	Johnson, Sam
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Jones

Joyce	Murphy (PA)	Scott (VA)
Kaptur	Napolitano	Scott, Austin
Keating	Neal	Scott, David
Kelly (IL)	Negrete McLeod	Sensenbrenner
Kelly (PA)	Neugebauer	Serrano
Kennedy	Noem	Sessions
Kildee	Nolan	Sewell (AL)
Kilmer	Nugent	Shea-Porter
Kind	Nunes	Sherman
King (IA)	O'Rourke	Shimkus
King (NY)	Olson	Shuster
Kingston	Owens	Simpson
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Sinema
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Sires
Kline	Pascrell	Slaughter
Labrador	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (NE)
LaMalfa	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Lamborn	Payne	Smith (TX)
Lance	Pearce	Smith (WA)
Langevin	Pelosi	Southerland
Lankford	Perlmutter	Stewart
Latham	Perry	Stivers
Latta	Peters (CA)	Stockman
Levin	Peterson	Stutzman
Lewis	Petri	Swalwell (CA)
Lipinski	Pingree (ME)	Takano
LoBiondo	Pittenger	Terry
Loeb	Pitts	Thompson (CA)
Lofgren	Pocan	Thompson (MS)
Long	Poe (TX)	Thompson (PA)
Lowenthal	Polis	Thornberry
Lowe	Pompeo	Tierney
Lucas	Posey	Tipton
Luetkemeyer	Price (GA)	Titus
Lujan Grisham	Price (NC)	Tonko
(NM)	Quigley	Tsongas
Luján, Ben Ray	Radel	Turner
(NM)	Rahall	Upton
Lummis	Rangel	Valadao
Maffei	Reed	Van Hollen
Maloney, Sean	Reichert	Vargas
Marchant	Renacci	Veasey
Marino	Ribble	Vela
Matheson	Rice (SC)	Velázquez
Matsui	Rigell	Visclosky
McCarthy (CA)	Roby	Wagner
McCarthy (NY)	Roe (TN)	Walden
McCauley	Rogers (AL)	Walz
McClintock	Rogers (MI)	Wasserman
McCollum	Rokita	Schultz
McDermott	Rooney	Waters
McGovern	Ros-Lehtinen	Watt
McHenry	Roskam	Waxman
McIntyre	Ross	Weber (TX)
McKinley	Rothfus	Webster (FL)
McMorris	Roybal-Allard	Welch
Rodgers	Royce	Wenstrup
McNerney	Ruiz	Whitfield
Meadows	Runyan	Williams
Meehan	Ruppersberger	Wilson (FL)
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Meng	Ryan (WI)	Wittman
Messer	Salmon	Womack
Mica	Sanchez, Loretta	Woodall
Michaud	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Miller (FL)	Scalise	Yoder
Miller (MI)	Schakowsky	Yoho
Miller, Gary	Schiff	Young (AK)
Miller, George	Schneider	Young (FL)
Mullin	Schock	Young (IN)
Mulvaney	Schrader	
Murphy (FL)	Schwartz	

NAYS—2

Massie  
NOT VOTING—40

Amash	Jordan	Peters (MI)
Bachmann	Kuster	Richmond
Bass	Larsen (WA)	Rogers (KY)
Castro (TX)	Larson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Denham	Lee (CA)	Rush
Deutch	Lynch	Sánchez, Linda
Ellison	Maloney,	T.
Fattah	Carolyn	Schweikert
Gerlach	Markey	Speier
Gingrey (GA)	McKeon	Tiberi
Graves (MO)	Moore	Walberg
Grimm	Moran	Walorski
Gutierrez	Nadler	Westmoreland
Hastings (FL)	Nunnelee	Wolf
Hinojosa		

□ 1905

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GRIMM. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 130 I was unavoidably detained and couldn't vote within the time allotted. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 130, had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

### PASCUA YAQUI TRIBE TRUST LAND ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 507) to provide for the conveyance of certain land inholdings owned by the United States to the Pascua Yaqui Tribe of Arizona, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 2, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—401

Aderholt	Castor (FL)	Ellmers
Alexander	Castro (TX)	Engel
Amodei	Chabot	Enyart
Andrews	Chaffetz	Eshoo
Bachus	Chu	Esty
Barber	Cicilline	Farenthold
Barletta	Clarke	Farr
Barr	Clay	Fincher
Barrow (GA)	Cleaver	Fitzpatrick
Barton	Clyburn	Fleischmann
Bass	Coble	Fleming
Beatty	Coffman	Flores
Becerra	Cohen	Forbes
Benishek	Cole	Fortenberry
Bentivolio	Collins (GA)	Foster
Bera (CA)	Collins (NY)	Fox
Bilirakis	Conaway	Frankel (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Connolly	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (NY)	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Fudge
Black	Cooper	Gabbard
Blackburn	Costa	Gallego
Blumenauer	Cotton	Garamendi
Bonamici	Courtney	Garcia
Bonner	Cramer	Gardner
Boustany	Crawford	Garrett
Brady (PA)	Crenshaw	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Crowley	Gibson
Braley (IA)	Cuellar	Gohmert
Bridenstine	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brooks (AL)	Cummings	Gosar
Brooks (IN)	Daines	Gowdy
Broun (GA)	Davis (CA)	Granger
Brown (FL)	Davis, Danny	Graves (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Rodney	Grayson
Buchanan	DeFazio	Green, Al
Bucshon	DeGette	Green, Gene
Burgess	Delaney	Griffin (AR)
Bustos	DeLauro	Griffith (VA)
Butterfield	DelBene	Grijalva
Calvert	Denham	Grimm
Camp	Dent	Guthrie
Campbell	DeSantis	Hahn
Cantor	DesJarlais	Hall
Capito	Diaz-Balart	Hanabusa
Capps	Dingell	Hanna
Capuano	Doggett	Harper
Cárdenas	Doyle	Harris
Carney	Duckworth	Hartzler
Carson (IN)	Duffy	Hastings (VA)
Carter	Duncan (SC)	Heck (NV)
Cartwright	Duncan (TN)	Heck (WA)
Cassidy	Edwards	Hensarling



Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Holding  
Holt  
Honda  
Horsford  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huffman  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurt  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Jenkins  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Labrador  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Lankford  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
Latta  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Lofgren  
Long  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lummis  
Maffei  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Massie  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McIntyre  
McKinley

McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Moore  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Negrete McLeod  
Neugebauer  
Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Owens  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Pastor (AZ)  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters (CA)  
Peterson  
Petri  
Pingree (ME)  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Polis  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Radel  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rokita  
Rooney  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Ruiz  
Runyan  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Salmon

Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schock  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Southernland  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Stockman  
Stutzman  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tierney  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner  
Walden  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (FL)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yarmuth  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Young (IN)

□ 1912

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, May 6 I missed three rollcall votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on No. 129, No. 130, and No. 131.

### AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE NATIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 32, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

## H. CON. RES. 32

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL HONOR GUARD AND PIPE BAND EXHIBITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Grand Lodge of the Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the National Honor Guard and Pipe Band Exhibition (in this resolution referred to as the "event"), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to allow law enforcement representatives to exhibit their ability to demonstrate Honor Guard programs and provide for a bag pipe exhibition.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 14, 2013, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

## SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

## SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

## SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays,

and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

### REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1406, WORKING FAMILIES FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2013

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 113-51) on the resolution (H. Res. 198) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

## CHIP GERDES

(Mrs. WAGNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to honor a legendary man, a loyal soldier in the battle for freedom in this great country—Chip Gerdes of my neighboring State of Illinois.

Chip suddenly passed away this morning in his home, where he was a loving father and a devoted husband. He was a loyal friend to me and to my family and was a faithful patriot to so many. Chip was the type of person we all strive to be in politics: he reached across all divides to bring people together for a common purpose.

I know Chip is smiling down on all of us today, cracking a joke about how serious we are about a man who never missed an opportunity to lighten the mood—and who would always fire up the room. Chip Gerdes will be missed by many, but his memory and his fight will continue.

We love you, Chip. We already miss you, and we will never stop fighting for what you devoted your life to defend: life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Rest easy, my friend. We've got it from here.

## SAFE CLIMATE CAUCUS

(Mr. WAXMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to continue the work of the Safe Climate Caucus in focusing on the threats posed to our Nation by climate change.

The world's top scientific institutions are all telling us that we have a rapidly closing window to reduce our carbon pollution before the catastrophic impacts of climate change cannot be avoided. The World Bank recently answered the question of why we should address climate change. Their report described what the world

## NAYS—2

Amash  
Herrera Beutler

## NOT VOTING—29

Bachmann  
Deutch  
Ellison  
Fattah  
Gerlach  
Gingrey (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Gutierrez  
Hastings (FL)  
Jordan  
Kuster  
Larsen (WA)  
Lee (CA)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Markey  
McKeon  
Moran  
Nadler  
Nunnelee  
Peters (MI)  
Richmond  
Rohrabacher  
Speier  
Tiberi  
Walberg  
Walorski  
Westmoreland  
Wolf



will look like if we continue on our current path.

According to the World Bank, a world that warms by 4 degrees Celsius would suffer from unprecedented heat waves, the flooding of coastal cities, increased risks of food and water scarcity, severe droughts, and irreversible damage to ecosystems. Coral reefs would dissolve due to ocean acidification unmatched in the Earth's history. Extreme heat waves would likely become the new normal for summertime.

With impacts like these, it is clear that we cannot allow 4 degrees of warming to occur. There is widespread agreement that we must act. Members of the House must take action.

□ 1920

#### HONORING CHIP GERDES

(Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today without prepared remarks but to join my colleague, ANN WAGNER, in honoring a great friend, Chip Gerdes.

Chip, a 41-year-old who leaves behind a beautiful wife and a beautiful daughter and is someone who was larger than life in Illinois and in Illinois politics, died this morning way too young.

With Chip Gerdes, you never knew what that phone call was going to bring when his name popped through on your caller ID, and it's a phone call that I sadly stand here today to say I will never be able to take again.

But it was my friendship with Chip and friendship that he had with others like ANN, and many throughout Illinois and Missouri, that made us stand here today and honor him and honor his legacy.

Chip Gerdes, you were a friend to many and a foe to none. Chip Gerdes, rest in peace, my friend, and I will say this on the floor today in your honor: "Roll Tide."

#### CONGRATULATING AMADOR VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL'S "WE THE PEOPLE" TEAM

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Last week, Amador Valley High School from California, in my congressional district, competed in the national We the People competition held right here in Washington, D.C., and I'm proud to report that the students of Amador Valley High School's We the People competition team took second place out of 44 participating teams representing their States across the country.

The We the People competition is held annually, where each State can send one team to Washington, D.C., to compete in mock congressional hearings that test the high school students'

knowledge of U.S. history and the Constitution.

I met with Amador Valley's We the People team while they were here, and I was thoroughly impressed with their participation, preparation, and knowledge of our history, government, and political system. The students' love of history and civics was welcome to see. They're truly a model for students across the country.

I also want to recognize their coaches, Brian Ladd and Mairi Wohlgemuth, who worked tirelessly to organize the team and prepare the students for this competition.

Congratulations again to Amador Valley High School and their students from the We the People program. You make me, our region, and our country proud.

#### TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI, LIBYA

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, "Benghazi happened a long time ago."

"What difference does it make?"

"Let's get done with this, folks. I don't think anybody lied to anybody. I do not want to spend the next year coming up here talking about Benghazi."

Mr. Speaker, these are statements made by the President's Pinocchio puppet press secretary, Jay Carney, and both the current and former Secretaries of State.

Americans are learning the White House bungled Benghazi, and now it faces accusations by whistleblowers of intimidation and hiding the facts.

Fearful of a terrorist attack, Ambassador Stevens asked for more security; calls for help were ignored; the cavalry never came; and he and three others were murdered. But the White House spinmaster said after the attack it was a "spontaneous protest" caused by a video. That was a made-up yarn. The attack was a carefully coordinated and calculated terrorist attack.

So why did the administration intentionally and knowingly mislead Americans?

The President told a graduating class over the weekend to reject those who say our government can't be trusted. Well, Mr. Speaker, Benghazi is a perfect example of why the national motto is not "In Government We Trust."

And that's just the way it is.

#### CONGRATULATING THE CITY COLLEGES OF CHICAGO

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week, I had the opportunity to attend the City Colleges of Chicago's graduation, seven city colleges with more than 4,000 graduates.

So I congratulate the mayor of the city of Chicago; the chairman of the board of the City Colleges, Dr. Paula Wolff; the chancellor, Cheryl Hyman; and all of the faculty and staff. This was the highest number of individuals who have ever graduated from the City Colleges of Chicago at one time. I congratulate them, all of the administration and all of those who made it happen.

#### TO OUR FRIENDS IN COLOMBIA

(Mr. RADEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RADEL. Mr. Speaker, I was recently in the beautiful, spectacular, booming country of Colombia, in part reaffirming a relationship with our ally and friend, and also there to make sure our investments are safe.

Our investments are safe, and they're paying off by growing the Colombian economy, and for you, the hardworking American taxpayer, growing our economy right here in the United States. Free trade and economic freedom mean that both countries prosper.

Their economy is growing and the income inequality gap is getting smaller and smaller, meaning a larger middle class. When Colombia does well, the United States does well. And while we may have a few differences here and there with other countries in Latin America, let there be no doubt that Colombia is a bright, shining example for all of the world when we work together.

So to our friends from all over Colombia: paisas, rolos, costenos, vallunos, opitas, llaneros, y Calenos.

Using your native language, let's continue to share our common dream of oportunidad y libertad para todos: opportunity and freedom for all.

#### WALK TO CREATE A WORLD FREE OF MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past Saturday, I had the honor of participating in the Walk to Create a World Free of Multiple Sclerosis. Sponsored by the Pennsylvania Chapter of the National MS Society, this Erie County event provided hope for people living with MS, their families and loved ones.

Nationwide, the Walk MS: 2013 campaign will include 250,000 participants across 700 cities to raise awareness and support for research and services for those living with multiple sclerosis.

Now, more than any time in history, there are more therapies in development for MS. Basic and clinical research has led to the development of many of the approved disease-modifying drugs for MS, including new oral medications.

Congratulations to the National Multiple Sclerosis Society for having

trained or funded many of the leading MS researchers creating these life-changing breakthroughs.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank Lori and Tommy Straub for inviting me to be a part of Team “Walk a Myelin My Shoes.” Together, we will continue to work towards a world free of MS.

#### STOP CLOSING PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and thank the community of North Forest and the North Forest Independent School District.

This has been a tumultuous week. This school district, undeserving, has fallen prey and victim to the closing of public schools in a public school system—this district that has acceptable schools; this district that has homeowners who have taxed themselves to ensure excellence in the teaching of these children, 7,500 students that are happy to be in a small pond and be a big fish. It is sad that the TEA administrator has undeservedly offered to close this school district without accepting an offer of compromise.

This is time for the Secretary of Education to act on the massive closings of public schools throughout America. This is time for the U.S. Department of Justice to act on preventing the elimination of elected school board members and utilizing section 5.

But more importantly, I want to thank the ombudsman coalition headed by Dr. Ken Campbell and President Robinson, the presidents of the Ministers Alliance who carried on a prayer vigil this last week. I do believe that prayers will be answered, the children will be saved, and we'll stop closing public schools in America.

□ 1930

#### PETSMART PROMISE

(Mr. SCHWEIKERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, this is actually one of those moments when you get to stand in front of the House with sort of a happy story. There's an organization out there called Family Promise. They are in 41 States with, I believe, about 160,000 volunteers, and they've had an issue for years now. They bring in homeless families, but often those homeless families would have a pet, a furry family member.

Just this week, PetSmart set up PetSmart Promise. I actually got to see this firsthand in Scottsdale, Arizona, where they actually are taking care of that furry friend of that homeless family that needs to get their life back in order. So PetSmart gets a real

call out from us. Family Promise is doing amazing things, and this is just one of those moments where you're very proud of a corporate entity like this, stepping up and working with Family Promise to help homeless families around the country.

#### CBC HOUR: ELIMINATING HEALTH DISPARITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, thank you.

We are pleased to come to this body at this time for this hour of power with the Congressional Black Caucus. This evening, we'd like to focus on eliminating health disparities in America.

Health is a cornerstone of equal opportunity, which is why access to quality, affordable care is so important. Sickness not only decreases individual and social productivity, but without access to health resources, many get sick and never truly recover. Over this next hour, members of the Congressional Black Caucus will discuss our priorities, working together with the President, our colleagues on the other side and throughout this body, and in the other Chamber, to address the needs of health care for all Americans, and specifically to eliminate the health disparities in the African-American communities.

I'd like to recognize the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. Under her leadership, the CBC is advancing a number of priorities during this 113th Congress. I yield to the gentlelady from Ohio, Chairwoman FUDGE.

Ms. FUDGE. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want to thank my colleagues, both Congressmen HORSFORD AND JEFFRIES, again for leading the Congressional Black Caucus Special Order hour. This hour is to discuss health disparities. You both have done an incredible job carrying the message of the CBC on the House floor each week, and I thank you.

Mr. Speaker, the health disparities between African Americans and other racial and ethnic populations are striking. When compared with the country as a whole, African Americans are three times more likely to die from diabetes. We account for about 44 percent of all new HIV infections among adults and adolescents, despite representing only about 13 percent of the U.S. population. African-American men can expect to live approximately 6 years less than White men. African-American women are twice as likely to give birth to low-weight infants, and our children are almost five times more likely to be hospitalized for asthma.

Though health disparities manifest in life-threatening ways, such as lower life expectancy and higher disease rates, the root cause is poverty. Where

you live and how you live have a direct effect on how long and how well you live. Until we address the persistent poverty that plagues our communities, the debilitating cost of health disparities will continue to rise.

According to the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, health disparities collectively cost minorities more than \$1.24 trillion from 2003 to 2006. We must create and maintain a path toward greater health equity in America. We can't afford the status quo.

Thankfully, a path to equity has begun to take shape, a path that reduces the rates of illness and premature death and increases access to quality health care. The solution was and is the Affordable Care Act—or, as it is known to many, ObamaCare. We are proud to call it ObamaCare because it proves that the President and many in this Congress really do care about the health of Americans.

ObamaCare has already begun to lower the cost of health care by providing financial relief for consumers, increasing insurance options, investing in preventative and primary care, and placing a focus on minority health. The ACA helps decrease health disparities by collecting data, strengthening cultural training, and increasing diversity in the health care field. These investments are critically important and will strengthen America's financial future.

Some on the other side of the aisle believe the status quo is sufficient, that health disparities are not real. Some don't believe that the impact of disparities on families is devastating. That's why a number of Republicans are again calling for the repeal of the ACA. How many times do we have to play this game?

The CBC will continue to stand up, speak out and defend the Affordable Care Act against all of those who oppose it for political or ideological reasons. Attaining health equity is to the benefit of all Americans, and is not only consistent with the American promise of opportunity, but it is critical to the future of Black America.

Mr. HORSFORD. At this time I would like to recognize the vice chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, a leader on a number of key issues that the Congressional Black Caucus is facing this 113th Congress, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Let me thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, for yielding time this evening, and thank you for your leadership not only here in the Congress but in the Congressional Black Caucus. You have come to this Congress, and you've done so much in such a short period of time. Thank you, Mr. JEFFRIES and Ms. FUDGE as well, for your leadership.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to start this conversation this evening by talking about a 1985 report. President Ronald Reagan was President at the time, and the U.S. Department of Health and

Human Services issued a statement. They called health disparities in the United States of America “an affront both to our ideals and to the ongoing genius of American medicine.”

It's disgusting, Mr. Speaker, that in this year, 2013, health disparities still exist in the richest and most powerful country in the world. African Americans are disproportionately less healthy. Life-threatening diseases like high blood pressure, diabetes, and heart disease are ravaging our population.

Oftentimes African Americans that live in rural communities, like the one that I represent in North Carolina, don't have insurance, and they have difficulty finding a regular primary care doctor, and so they go without an annual physical or regular checkups. Sometimes their only interaction with a health care provider is when they call 911 because their unchecked blood pressure resulted in a heart attack or stroke. By then it's too late. If that same person suffering from a stroke would have had access to care, their high blood pressure may have been diagnosed early.

□ 1940

They may have been put on medication meant to regulate their condition, making a heart attack or stroke less likely.

Many African Americans do play an active role in their health care, but the quality of the care they receive can be much worse than their white counterparts, further widening the gulf of disparities.

A significant driver of these disparities is the lack of health insurance, and that's what the gentlelady spoke about a moment ago. African Americans make up 13 percent of the entire population, but account for more than 50 percent of all people who are uninsured.

African Americans are also likely to have disproportionately lower access to primary care and often receive poorer quality care and face more barriers in seeking treatment for chronic-disease management.

The Affordable Care Act that we're all so proud of was designed to put a premium on quality of care, increase access, and encourage and reward good health care outcomes. I am a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act, and my constituents in North Carolina are as well.

Every person should have access to affordable quality health care, regardless of who they are, where they come from, or how much money they have in their bank accounts.

Before the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, 50 million people lived without health insurance. An additional 38 million people had insurance, but it was woefully inadequate and charged them exorbitant coinsurance payments and huge copays and completely unmanageable out-of-pocket expenses, essentially making them un-

insured too. That means nearly one-third of all Americans were without the very basic insurance needed to see a health care professional and receive care at an affordable price.

When President Barack Obama proposed, and Congressional Democrats introduced, the Affordable Care Act, Republicans stirred up for a battle. And they would scream in the town hall meetings all across the country, and even right here on this House floor, about how the bill would create death panels that would decide if a person was worthy of receiving treatment for a particular disease. That was not correct.

They would insist that the bill would cut hundreds of millions of dollars from Medicare. Not correct. In fact, the Affordable Care Act specifically prohibits cuts to the guaranteed Medicare benefits.

They would bring out charts on this floor and graphs that showed how the Affordable Care Act will be a “job killer” worse than we have ever experienced before. That turned out to be a lie.

The cost of health care has risen each year, insurance coverage has decreased each year, and the amount of uncompensated care has increased every year.

Mr. HORSFORD, here's a statistic that really stands out with me: in 1970, the United States spent \$75 billion on health care. That was 7.2 percent of GDP. In 2010, health care spending represented 17.9 percent of GDP and, if not for the Affordable Care Act, was expected to reach 20 percent by the year 2020.

The U.S. spends more of its dollars for health care-related expenses than any other country in the world, and the uncontrolled rise in the cost of health care would have been completely unsustainable if not for ObamaCare.

President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act into law and, with the stroke of a pen, revolutionized health care in America. Insurance companies can no longer deny coverage to people with preexisting conditions or charge them more than anyone else. There is now no lifetime dollar limit on what insurers will pay for claims.

Preventative visits to health care providers are now free, yes, free, and even include some free vaccinations. Young adults can now stay on their parents' policy until they're 26 years old. And all new group health plans now have to cover all recommendations by the U.S. Preventative Services Task Force.

Now, millions of people in our country, and in my congressional district and, Mr. HORSFORD, in your congressional district, who were living without the most basic health insurance can benefit from the most advanced health care technology in the world.

My only disappointment, Mr. Speaker, is that some of our Republican Governors and State legislatures across the country are refusing to participate in the expansion of Medicaid. Shame on them.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I am confident that because of the Affordable Care Act the delta of health disparities in America will begin to shrink. No matter the color of your skin or the amount of money you have, each and every American deserves high-quality health care so they can live long and prosperous lives.

Mr. HORSFORD, I thank you so very much for yielding time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chairman, and thank you for your leadership and commitment on these issues. And I know we will continue to fight and advocate for the preservation of the Affordable Care Act and, as you indicate, the proper implementation of that act with the expansion of Medicaid and the other key provisions of the law which we need our local and State partners to work with us in providing quality health care for all Americans.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORSFORD. At this time I'd like to yield to the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus' Health Brain Trust, the doctor in the House, the person who knows more about health care than most, the honorable gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN).

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN. Thank you, Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you and our other colleague, Mr. JEFFRIES, for hosting these Special Orders every week. It's been with great pride that we've watched our young new Members come to the floor and present the case so forcefully and so effectively to the American people and the disparities in all areas that African Americans and other people of color and the poor are facing.

Before I start, Representative BARBARA LEE of California could not be with us this evening, but her work on HIV and AIDS, and other areas in health care, but specifically in HIV and AIDS, both here in the United States and across the globe, is worthy of recognition; and I know that she'll be entering a statement for the RECORD on some of the issues around HIV and AIDS.

I want to just go back a little bit and present a little bit of historical context on just how long this battle to eliminate health disparities has been going on. I'm going to go back—of course, it goes back to slavery, but I want to go back to W.E.B. DuBois in 1899, when he said, and I'm quoting:

There have been few other cases in the history of civilized peoples where human suffering has been viewed with such peculiar indifference.

And then 25 or so years later, and this was mentioned by Congressman

BUTTERFIELD, in 1985, the Heckler Report, where it was said, and I'm quoting here:

There was a continuing disparity in the burden of dealt and illness experienced by blacks and other minority Americans as compared with our Nation's population as a whole.

And as he said:

The stubborn disparity remained. The stubborn disparity remained an affront to both our ideals and the genius of American medicine.

Surgeon General Heckler was very surprised by what that report found, but when she asked her researchers, well, why is this, the only answer that they could give her is, it's always been that way.

And so that stubborn indifference that W.E.B. DuBois mentioned in 1899 continued into as far as 25 years later.

Almost 20 years later, the IOM issued its unequal treatment report which said:

In unassailable terms, the report found that even when insurance and income are as the same as those of whites, minorities often receive fewer tests, less sophisticated treatment for a panoply of ailments, including heart disease, cancer, diabetes and HIV/AIDS.

So even when you have insurance, even when your educational level, even when your income is the same, you are still not getting the same treatment. And so it's no wonder that African Americans and other people of color have suffered from disparities for so long.

So in 2003, led then by Jesse Jackson, Jr., we insisted that there be a report every year on health disparities, a national report. And the very last one, so we're in our 11th year now, well, we're in our 10th year now, and the very last report shows very little change.

□ 1950

It showed that blacks received worse care—it talks about quality—than whites for 41 percent of quality measures. Hispanics receive worse care than non-Hispanic whites for 39 percent of measures. Asians and American Indians and Alaskan Natives receive worse care than whites for nearly 30 percent of quality measures. And in terms of access, blacks had worse access to care for 32 percent of access measures, Asians for 17 percent, American Indians and Alaskan Natives for 62 percent, and Hispanics 63 percent of the measures.

So as we look over the years from 1899 to 2011, which is what this report is on, there has been very, very little change. Among the themes that emerge from the report, health care quality and access are suboptimal, especially for racial and ethnic minorities, and this is in 2011. I'm sure the report this year is not going to be any different. Quality is improving, but disparities are not improving.

There are several areas where disparities are worsening over time between minorities and whites. Those are maternal deaths in the black popu-

lation and breast cancer diagnosed at an advanced age for women in the black population. Children zero to 40 pounds—their families are not getting advice in the Asian population about seatbelts. Adults over 50 not receiving colonoscopy, sigmoidoscopy or anything in the American Indian and Alaskan Native populations.

So when looking at these reports coming back the same way year after year, the Tri-Caucus, the Black, Hispanic and Asian Caucus, when we began to debate the Affordable Care Act and to write the Affordable Care Act, we came together and said health equity had to be a major and core goal of health care reform. We were able to insert into the bill many of the provisions that we had worked on for many years to create health equity and to begin to eliminate health disparities. So we call on all people across the country to support us and make sure that all of those attempts to repeal the Affordable Care Act, which would close the door that we have been able to open for so many who have not had access to quality health care for so long—that door would not be closed again.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you again to the gentlelady from the Virgin Islands and the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus' health brain trust for laying out, again, the hard work that the Congressional Black Caucus has been involved with for many years in getting to the point with the Affordable Care Act now on the cusp of being fully implemented in January of 2014. So when our colleagues on the other side spend time bringing up legislation to repeal the Affordable Care Act now more than 30 times after this legislation has been approved by Congress, it has been upheld by the courts, it has been signed by the President, and the American public are desperate for quality health care—that is why we are coming here today to say enough is enough. Thirty times to repeal the Affordable Care Act—how many more times will we waste the people's, House's and our time bringing these issues forward when we need to be working together to implement the Affordable Care Act in the way that it is intended?

At this time, I would like to yield to the second vice chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. She is a strong leader for her constituents, the gentlelady from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE. Thank you, very much, Congressman HORSFORD, and I thank you for your leadership along with Congressman JEFFRIES in leading the Special Order hour for the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus to raise awareness about health disparities that continue to affect racial and ethnic minorities in the United States of America. Despite medical advances that save many lives in our country, there has been very limited progress in ending the racial

and ethnic disparities in health. In a 1985 report, the United States Department of Health and Human Services called health disparities in this country "an affront both to our ideals and to the ongoing genius of American medicine." Now, decades later, health disparities still exist between black and white and rich and poor.

A primary reason for these disparities is, quite frankly, the lack of health insurance that has been a problem for all these many years. For instance, African Americans make up 13 percent of the entire population but account for more than half of all people who are uninsured. Blacks also have disproportionately lower access to primary care and face more obstacles in seeking treatment.

Across our Nation, health disparities continue to persist and widen in communities historically marginalized as a result of poverty and other social, economic and environmental barriers. These communities are experiencing a high burden of life-threatening diseases and poor health outcomes.

Population-based approaches such as recent efforts to reduce childhood obesity rates, while showing evidence of success, have been primarily focused on white children in affluent communities. For example, in a report released in 2012 by the CDC, New York showed an overall decline of as much as 10 percent in obesity rates for kindergartners. However, for poor black children, the decline was only 1.9 percent, and for Hispanic children it was 3.4 percent.

In my district in Brooklyn, New York, I represent a very large number of immigrants. Close to 40 percent of the residents are first- and second-generation Americans. Culturally significant and linguistically tailored education is required to address health disparities. This education is one of the building blocks upon which improvements in early detection and screening in these communities have been built.

Health disparities are a serious matter. According to the National Urban League's State of Urban Health report, in 2009, health disparities cost the United States economy \$82.2 billion. I firmly believe in prevention and addressing health disparities, and that it will go a long way in bringing these costs down. It is important that we fully engage in a full implementation of the Affordable Care Act. This will lead us to closing these disparities, this health disparity gap.

I look forward to working with my colleagues in the Congressional Black Caucus and, quite frankly, all Members of goodwill to find solid solutions to addressing health disparities in communities of color across this Nation.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the time.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you to the gentlelady from New York, and I appreciate, again, all of her hard work and her commitment on these issues and her willingness to, again, reach across

the aisle as you said. We are here to work with anybody who wants to work with us to find solutions to the health care crisis that exists in America. But we need them to understand that voting to repeal the Affordable Care Act is not that solution. There are many more things that we can do together to provide access to health care than we can by repealing this very important legislation.

At this time, I would like to recognize, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to first of all commend our colleagues for coming here every week raising issues and promoting awareness. Tonight it is health care, health care disparities.

I believe that the big problem with the eradication of the disparities is the fact that we, as a nation, have not committed ourselves to the concept that health care ought to be a right and not a privilege. As the most technologically proficient nation on the face of the Earth, as the wealthiest nation with a quality of life for large numbers of people—that is commendable—we still have not reached the point where we take the position that every person, no matter what their status or circumstance, deserves the highest quality of health care that our Nation can afford for them.

□ 2000

So until we reach that point, we will continue to have studies and reports and we will continue to look at disparities, and we'll keep doing it and doing it and doing it and doing it again.

We will have legislation like the Affordable Care Act that is designed to close some of the gaps. And it does, in fact, close some of the gaps, and it's commendable that we have done that.

But I maintain that we have a health care system that really is a sickness care system. We do a good job of treating illnesses and sickness when people can get to the places where they get the treatment.

I had a call yesterday from a person who suggested that they had gone to the emergency room at the hospital and were given two Tylenol and sat in a room for a good period of time. When they inquired of the hospital why they had done that, they told them, Well, it's because of the ObamaCare; that ObamaCare is causing this to happen to you.

Now, the person actually has been on Social Security disability for a long time, before there was any ObamaCare and there was a way to pay for their health care, and somebody took the opportunity to misrepresent ObamaCare. I would hope that people would not, especially people in the industry, people in the business, would not do that.

But I also urge individual citizens to take more responsibility for our health. You know, there's still disparities in smoking, still disparities in drinking too much alcohol, still dis-

parities in not having the appropriate diet or the exercise that is needed. So we've got to tack on several fronts. We've never put enough resources into the systems to make sure that they work properly and appropriately. We need to put more money into health education, health promotion, health awareness, so that individual citizens have a greater understanding of what it is that they individually can do.

Of course, people who know me know that I promote community health centers as the best way of providing ambulatory health care to large numbers of low-income people more effectively than anything else we've come up with, with the exception of Medicare and Medicaid, in a long time. I still promote these institutions as being one of the best ways in local communities of having health care delivery where people themselves are involved. These centers provide jobs and work opportunities and help keep the money in the neighborhood so that the impact of poverty is not as great as it would be.

So, Mr. HORSFORD, again, I want to thank you; I want to thank Mr. JEFFRIES; and I want to commend the caucus for raising the issues, promoting awareness, and helping, hopefully, to develop a different level of understanding. Health care ought to be a right and not a privilege.

Mr. HORSFORD. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Illinois and, again, just to highlight, as you indicated, the community health centers as an important provision of support within the health care delivery system.

Both rural and urban communities suffer from the disproportionate distribution of health care resources and access to care. Community health care centers play an important component in overcoming that care, providing millions of health care services, particularly to people of color, access to high-quality and affordable care in both rural and urban areas.

I know in my own district, in Nevada's Fourth Congressional District, we have 14 health centers throughout our region. From my rural parts to the urban parts, these are very important areas. But unfortunately, under the sequester, Mr. Speaker, these are still areas that are under attack because cuts to these health care centers are still being imposed because of the uncertainty of the sequester.

In my district, Nevada health centers, they're looking at over \$700,000 worth of reductions between now and September; elimination of nursing positions and elimination of services for children and seniors at a time when people are sick and they need it the most.

So I would hope that, again, we can work together with Members on the other side to come up with solutions to replace the sequester and to fully fund community health centers, who are providing such good care to our citizens at this time.

I would like to yield now, Mr. Speaker, to the gentlelady from Texas, Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I thank the conveners of this Special Order and express my appreciation to Mr. HORSFORD and to Mr. JEFFRIES for continuing to educate our colleagues on extremely important issues. And I'm delighted to join the Congressional Black Caucus as it proceeds continuously to ensure that we advocate for those who cannot speak for themselves.

I want to take up an issue that has struck home and is being confronted by many States, some of which are in the South and some are in other places throughout the Nation. I was very pleased to stand with my fellow Democrats and support the Affordable Care Act. I could go through the journey of 2009 and 2010, when many of us spread out across the country and confronted misinformation through town hall meetings, controversy, and conflictedness.

I think that what should be continuously emphasized as the President's leadership on one single point: that although health care was not listed, *per se*, in the Constitution, it should be a constitutional right. If you read the words or quote the words of the Declaration of Independence, we hold these truths to be self-evident, that we have certain unalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, one might argue that education and health care fall into those provisions of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It was in the context of that framework in the original words of the Constitution that, as you open the book that has the provisions of the Constitution, the opening phraseology indicates that we have come together to create a more perfect Union. I think the Affordable Care Act was intended to try and lift the boats of all people.

Interestingly enough, major hospitals across America were clamoring for the passage of this legislation to really do what we're speaking about, which is to cut into the health disparities, because our hospitals across America were suffering from not being reimbursed on uncompensated care for those people who came without insurance. Many of them included African Americans, who suffered in larger numbers from the difficulties with diabetes, for example.

Texas, which is now in the eye of the storm, is one of those States that has rejected the expansion of Medicaid, which goes to the very point of increasing opportunities for those who suffer disparities so they can have access to health care. That is largely the problem in Texas. Federal funding for the adult expansion far exceeds current local expenses for unreimbursed health care costs, having 3 years without any match whatsoever and then having the ability to have a very small match later on.

It is estimated that Medicaid expansion would generate more than 231,000

jobs in 2016, a 1.8 percentage point reduction in the State's current unemployment from 6.1 percent to 4.3 percent, and it would directly address the disparities in diabetes, heart disease, and HIV/AIDS, in partnership with our federally qualified health clinics, which many States have seen expanded because of the Affordable Care Act. And now in my home State, my city in particular, Central Care has now put more community health clinics in areas where disparities were severe and lives were being lost.

It benefits children as well. I'd like to cite some numbers here for my colleagues to indicate what we would benefit from by the expansion of Medicare.

□ 2010

Unreimbursed health care costs for charity care in 2010, for an estimated \$4.4 billion in unreimbursed expenses. We would be covering that.

We would also get off the number one list. Texas, number one, ranking among States with the greatest share of uninsured residents at 23.8 percent in 2011, more than 6 million people, compared with the national average of 15.7 percent.

And then, as I indicated, we would, again, eliminate the opportunity for low-income adults to be able to secure care. When low-income adults don't get care, the children don't get care.

So I am suggesting that the rejection by Governor Perry, along with other Governors, to not accept expanded Medicaid has a direct impact on the increase, not only of the uninsured, but the increase in the numbers of those suffering from certain diseases who cannot get care and, therefore, rather than have preventative care, which an expansion of Medicaid would provide, allowing for doctor visits, then the only time that we are able to secure health care for them is when they arrive in the cities and the counties and the States' emergency rooms, where we see a surge in emergency room costs, health care costs, and we eliminate the good will and the good intentions of a very good bill that answers the question, are we attempting to form a more perfect union by establishing a framework of insurance for all Americans, hardworking Americans, Americans of Asian descent and African descent and Hispanic descent, who have different DNA and cultural indices that would lead them to have certain diseases more than others.

Let me also take note of the fact that one of those particular diseases that impacts the African American woman in a more devastating manner than in others, and that is triple negative breast cancer that impacts Hispanic women, African American women and Anglo women, but more so in the African American community. That kind of diagnosis gives in this current phrase of time a short and almost devastating diagnosis, one that is difficult to recover from, one that sees an increase in the loss of life.

So I would make the argument to Governor Perry and to Governors across the Nation who have rejected the expanded Medicaid as a budget issue, as a political issue, as a "I'm going to stand up to the President" issue, you are wrong, you are absolutely wrong, because this is not a political issue; this is a life and death question. And I want to applaud Governors like those in Florida, who certainly, obviously, may not welcome the applause. But I think it's important when people stand on principle or what is good for others, that they should be applauded.

So I applaud the Governor of Ohio and the Governor of Florida for moving forward on Medicaid expansion. And I would say to my good friend, who is leading this very important Special Order, that we need to begin to work with the President to find ways to substitute the rejection of the Medicaid expansion so that individuals that are in these States who cannot speak for themselves, who in actuality have a head of State Governor that is making a political decision, a simple political decision, will not lose out on the benefits intended by the Affordable Care Act, which is to give comfort and to give help and aid to those who need health care.

I finish on this note. I want to thank Dr. CHRISTENSEN, because when we began to write this legislation with the Congressional Black Caucus that, one, talked about the health care disparity, which was the premise of the fact of expanding health care, it would be a shame if after all this work and passage of this bill there would be innocent persons in our respective States like Texas that could not benefit from something that could save lives.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

#### WHY TEXAS SHOULD EXTEND MEDICAID COVERAGE TO LOW-INCOME ADULTS LOCAL BENEFITS

Local savings from the expansion would offset much if not all of the state match in 2016 and 2017. According to reports that cities, counties, hospital districts and local hospitals submit to the state, unreimbursed local health care spending in Texas that local property taxes largely support, totaled \$2.5 billion in 2011. In addition, Texas hospitals reported at least \$1.8 billion in conservatively estimated unreimbursed health care costs for charity care in 2010, for an estimated total of \$4.4 billion in unreimbursed expenses.

The math is simple—federal funding for the adult expansion far exceeds current local expenses for unreimbursed health care costs. Although the impact of the Medicaid expansion and ACA subsidized insurance would not entirely offset total local expenses, since not everyone currently receiving charity care, such as undocumented immigrants, would be eligible for these programs and since some services may not be covered, much of it would.

If necessary, the state could use some portion of these savings to fund the required match through an intergovernmental transfer arrangement. Local governments and hospitals would still realize a net gain over current costs from the federal funds the match would generate.

It is estimated that the Medicaid expansion would generate more than 231,000 jobs in 2016, equivalent to a 1.8 percentage point reduction in the state's current unemployment rate—from 6.1 percent to 4.3 percent.

#### STATE BENEFITS

In numerous programs, the state pays 100 percent for adult health care that Medicaid would cover under an expansion. For example, the Texas Department of Criminal Justice requested \$186.5 million in state appropriations for hospital inpatient and clinical care for its inmates for 2014.

The federal government contributes nothing toward this purpose now, but with a Medicaid expansion, the state would spend nothing on in-patient hospital care for eligible inmates from 2014 through 2016, and a maximum of just 10 percent of these costs by 2020. Similarly, the expansion would cover eligible adults in state mental institutions and juvenile facilities that need non-psychiatric hospital in-patient care.

The state also spends unmatched general revenue for community primary care services, mental and behavioral health services and, soon, women's health care delivered to low-income individuals who are not eligible for Medicaid. Other programs include the breast and cervical cancer program, the kidney health care program and the HIV Medication assistance and STD program. Furthermore, the state supplements funding for the County Indigent Health Care (CIHC) program, much of which would be unnecessary under a Medicaid expansion. The state also pays the regular state match for medically needy adults that currently qualify for Medicaid. Under an expansion, the state would be able to use the high federal match rate for newly eligible individuals not covered by Medicare.

The Comptroller's office estimates that larger caseloads from a Medicaid expansion would net increased revenues from the insurance premium tax due to the large number of persons who will buy health insurance under the exchange, as well as those covered in the expansion. The Comptroller estimates the increased insurance premium tax revenue due to ACA implementation and the Medicaid expansion at \$1.3 billion from 2015 through 2019, or an average of \$250 million a year.

In addition to these savings and new revenue that could offset the required state match, the expansion would generate an additional \$1.8 billion in new tax revenue from 2014 through 2017, assuming moderate enrollment—enough to offset nearly half of the required state match from 2014 through 2017. These jobs, many of them in health care, would provide substantial benefits and increased economic security to families and local communities. As employees spend their wages on taxable items, state and local governments benefit from increased tax collections, and the increased economic activity in turn creates other jobs.

#### BENEFITS TO CHILDREN

According to the Census Bureau, in 2011 Texas had about 900,000 or 16.7 percent of the nation's 5 million uninsured children, and nearly 600,000 of the nation's 3.5 million uninsured children with family incomes below 200 percent FPL, again a 16.7 percent share. About 13.2 percent of all Texas children are uninsured, compared to a national average of 7.5 percent.

Bringing Texas up to the national average would require the state to insure an additional 393,000 children, less than the 550,000 expected to enroll in Medicaid under a Moderate scenario. After 2014, the national average will increase significantly since most states will expand Medicaid, which means that, without the expansion, the disparity between Texas and other states will grow.



Studies conducted in the 1980s found that expanding Medicaid to children reduced child mortality by 5.1 percent and infant mortality by 8.5 percent. Assuming the lower 5.1 percent rate, the expansion would save the lives of 2,700 Texas children every year after full implementation.

#### BENEFITS TO ADULTS

Our children also need healthy parents to provide for their care. Many low-income individuals and families simply cannot afford basic living expenses, health insurance and out-of-pocket health care expenses, making a Medicaid expansion imperative.

The Kaiser Family Foundation estimates that about 41 percent of adults covered under the expansion would be parents. Many of them work, but lack health insurance. According to the Census Bureau, 59.9 percent of uninsured adults in Texas work, a higher labor force participation rate than the total population's. According to Kaiser, about 1.2 million adults who would be covered under the expansion in Texas are working, about 60 percent of them in agriculture or service industries that tend toward smaller firms and are less likely to offer insurance to employees.

Only 28.4 percent of the 320,334 Texas private firms with fewer than 50 employees insured their employees in 2011, versus 92.3 percent of the 132,109 larger private firms. And besides working for low wages in firms that do not offer health insurance, many low-income individuals find work only on a part-time or seasonal basis, resulting in poverty-level incomes.

The Medicaid expansion would cover a person employed in a full-time, minimum-wage job paying \$7.25 per hour, which equates to \$15,080 per year, just below the 138 percent FPL cutoff. It also would cover a single parent earning \$10 per hour (annual wages of \$20,800). These wages are generally insufficient to cover basic living and working expenses as well as health insurance.

The high cost of health insurance affects both employers and workers, but high premiums as well as out-of-pocket medical expenses make it impossible for most low-income workers to afford health care. The 2012 average cost of single coverage was \$5,615, and family coverage was \$15,745, a 30 percent increase since 2007, according to a recent study by the Kaiser Family Foundation and the Health Research and Educational Trust. Employees paid an average of \$951 for single coverage and \$4,316 for and \$11,429 for family coverage per employee, it is unsurprising that most small employers find it difficult to provide insurance.

Although the ACA provides subsidized health insurance for individuals above 100 percent of FPL, about 1.4 million uninsured Texas adults aged 18 to 64 who are below 100 percent of FPL will not be eligible. Covering most of these adults through Medicaid would mean a healthier workforce and would reduce absenteeism, job loss and unemployment insurance costs to employers. It also would increase income for families with children, thus reducing stress and providing more opportunities.

And, it would save lives. The Harvard School of Public Health recently compared three states (New York, Arizona and Maine) that expanded Medicaid to childless adults aged 20 to 64 between 2000 and 2005 with neighboring states that did not (New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Nevada and New Mexico). They found not only a higher insured rate in the expansion states, but a 6.1 percent drop in the death rate for adults under age 65, or about 2,840 deaths prevented each year for every 500,000 persons newly insured. This translates into one life saved per year in the five-year follow-up period for every 176

newly insured. In Texas, that would amount to about 5,700 lives saved per year under the Moderate enrollment scenario once fully implemented.

#### BENEFITS TO EMPLOYERS

Only 36 percent of U.S. workers in firms with fewer than 25 workers have insurance. In a Kaiser Family Foundation survey, 48 percent of small employers indicated that the cost of insurance was too high for them to offer it to employees.

On the other hand, when their uninsured employees become sick, they are more likely to be absent from work longer, creating a burden to their employer and fellow employees. Frequent or prolonged absences for common untreated conditions such as asthma, diabetes, heart disease, allergies and flu can lead to terminations and the costs of recruiting, hiring and training new employees. Expanding Medicaid to adults aged 18 through 64 who are making marginal wages or working in part-time or seasonal positions is an effective way to assist small businesses and their employees alike.

Finally, we estimate that the Medicaid expansion would generate nearly 71,500 jobs in Texas in 2014, rising to 231,100 jobs in 2016, the first year of full implementation. Many of these jobs would be in health care, an industry that pays well and provides good job security and benefits, including health insurance, and wages would average \$50,818 during the 2014–2017 period—the same as the statewide average for all industries.

Texas already has the highest rate of uninsured for adults aged 18 to 64 of any state—31 percent compared to a national average of 21 percent in 2011.<sup>45</sup> If Texas does not expand Medicaid, and Wal-Mart and other companies implement their intended policies, the number of uninsured in Texas will grow as it shrinks in states that acted, leaving Texas still at the bottom and digging a deeper hole.

#### FINDINGS IN OTHER STATES

Recent studies in other states have also found that states can finance their share of the expansion using funds already spent on state and locally funded health care for adults and new revenues generated from the expansion. After further study and considering revised trends, several states besides Texas have also substantially reduced their estimates of the state funds required for the expansion.

Some governors that previously expressed opposition to the expansion have changed their minds. In particular, Arizona's governor, Jan Brewer, initially in opposition, has recently announced that she will support it as long as Arizona includes an automatic trigger reducing Medicaid optional coverage should the federal government reduce its match rate in the future, a concern expressed by several state governors.<sup>46</sup> After reviewing a new study that identified sufficient existing revenue sources, New Mexico's governor, Susana Martinez, also announced her support for the expansion.

California. A recent study by the University of California at Berkeley and the University of California at Los Angeles on the California expansion found that increased state tax revenues and savings would largely offset additional spending. It also found that savings in other areas of the budget, including other state health programs, mental health services and state prisons due to the expansion "would likely be more than enough to offset the \$46 to \$381 million in annual state General Fund spending for the newly eligible population through 2019."

Florida. Florida has recently reduced its estimate of state costs from \$26 billion to \$5.066 billion over 10 years from 2013–14 to 2022–23, including costs for newly eligible adults (\$1.767 billion), children who are cur-

rently eligible but not enrolled (\$3.012 billion) and the cost of shifting, called "crowd out," of currently insured individuals to Medicaid (\$0.287 billion). The state now estimates that the expansion would generate \$37 billion in federal funds over the ten-year period, of which about \$30 billion is for newly eligible adults.

Ohio. Estimates just published by Ohio State University compare the state's match requirements with the net savings the state would receive from moving adults from state-funded programs to Medicaid over a nine-year period from 2014 through 2019, concluding that savings in these programs would provide 41.2 percent of the state match necessary for the expansion. The study estimated that the state would receive net savings of about \$1 billion on:

Better match rate for medically needy adults of \$709 million.

Breast and Cervical Cancer Program costs of \$48 million.

Inpatient prison health care costs of \$273 million.

In addition, the study pointed out that there would also be savings on non-Medicaid substance abuse treatment, family planning, pregnant women and other state health care programs for uninsured adults. The study identified other areas of savings as well, including reduced criminal justice costs due to better access to substance abuse treatment.

The study also found net increases in state revenue from taxes of \$2,898 million on: managed care plans (\$1.823 billion), general revenue (\$857 million) from increased economic activity and increased drug rebates to the state from pharmaceutical companies (\$218 million). The study estimates that the state will need about \$2.5 billion for state match, which would leave a net state fiscal gain of \$1.4 billion.

Wyoming. The Wyoming Department of Health issued a report in November 2012 that also looked for offsets to pay for the Medicaid expansion. The department found that "participating in the optional expansion of the Medicaid program would result in a projected cost savings for the State General Fund throughout the first 6 years of the ACA implementation (fiscal years 2014–2020)."

#### OBJECTIONS TO MEDICAID EXPANSION

The ACA and the Medicaid expansion have raised concerns in Texas and some other states about its long-term costs for state and local budgets, as well as other concerns. Objections to expansion in Texas primarily revolve around three arguments:

Medicaid is "socialized medicine" like that practiced in western Europe and expanding it would spread it further;

The federal government should abandon Medicaid and move to a system of block grants to states, to provide them with more "flexibility" in meeting their citizens' health care needs; and

The added cost burden of expansion, despite extremely favorable federal matching rates, is too much for a program that has already overburdened the state financially.

Socialized medicine: Medicaid is not socialized medicine. Socialized medicine as practiced in Western Europe, and specifically Great Britain, is a system under which the government not only funds but also operates hospitals, hires health care providers and controls every aspect of health care. Medicaid does not do these things; patients and their health care providers make health care decisions. Medicaid in no way meets the definition of "socialized medicine."

Medicaid is a federal insurance program that matches state funding to provide health care to eligible, low-income citizens who cannot afford private health insurance. States receive federal matching funds and



administer the program under federal rules that limit eligibility to certain groups and services and that provide states with flexibility within certain eligibility and service requirements. Texas participates in many similar federal programs that require state matching funds, including transportation, historic preservation and homeland security programs, among others.

**Block grants:** Some Texas lawmakers suggest that Medicaid is a “one-size-fits-all” program that fails to meet the state’s unique demographic and industry needs. They are petitioning the federal government to convert federal Medicaid funding to a block grant, with each state receiving a fixed amount to establish its own state-specific program that might or might not include all the features of the current program. Even for lawmakers who favor a block-grant approach, however, this argument should not affect the decision to extend Medicaid coverage under the ACA. In fact, lawmakers who favor a Medicaid block grant in particular should support extending Medicaid to low-income adults: the government typically bases block grants on historical funding levels, so maximizing federal funding now would better position Texas in the event of any future conversion to block grants.

**Cost burdens:** As noted above, state and local governments currently fund all of our expenditures for indigent care and in-patient hospital costs for eligible incarcerated individuals, while the state supplies 100 percent of funding for some adults served in state health care programs that would be eligible for Medicaid. These, combined with hospital charity costs, far exceed the amount Texas would be required to contribute to expand Medicaid. New revenue from insurance premium taxes and economic growth from the infusion of \$100 billion in federal funds would provide additional revenue sources. Furthermore, opting out of the expansion will not reduce Texans’ federal tax burden, nor will expanding Medicaid increase it.

Concerns that the federal government will not be able to maintain high match rates in the future are unlikely to become reality given that Congressional representatives and senators represent their states. To ensure against this event, however, Texas could build in an automatic “trigger,” such as Arizona is doing, to reduce Medicaid optional populations and services should Congress reduce the match rate in the future.

Governor Rick Perry has described extending Medicaid to low-income adults as “adding more passengers to the Titanic.” It would be closer to the case to say that failing to cover adults will doom them like those hapless travelers. Experience in other states indicates that the death rate would fall by 6.1 percent for adults under age 65 if the state expands Medicaid, preventing premature deaths of 5,700 Texas adults in each of the five years following the implementation year, or 28,500 Texans over five years. Previous studies also have found reductions of 5.1 percent in the child mortality rate and 8.5 percent in the infant mortality rate attributable to Medicaid coverage.

Such studies led one author from the Harvard study, Arnold M. Epstein, to conclude: Sometimes the political rhetoric is at odds with the evidence, such as claims that Medicaid is a ‘broken program’ or worse than no insurance at all; our findings suggest precisely the opposite.

#### CONCLUSION

Extending Medicaid to low-income adults will save tens of thousands of lives and improve millions more over the next decade and beyond. The jobs created will support hundreds of thousands of people and boost the economy. The additional tax revenue

will benefit state and local governments and important public purposes such as education, infrastructure and public safety. Businesses will benefit from healthier employees and lower employer insurance costs.

State and local government and the state’s hospitals collectively spend far more on piecemeal health care for low-income Texans than the state’s expected match for the expansion. Expanding Medicaid would move thousands of people into managed care from these programs and significantly reduce the use of expensive emergency room treatment for routine care.

Without expanding Medicaid to adults, Texas will still have to find additional state match for many of the eligible but unenrolled children identified in this report—but without the benefit of the additional state funds that an expansion would free up and without the new revenues that the additional federal funding would generate.

The decision to expand Medicaid—or not—will affect the lives of millions of Texans for years into the future and is arguably one of the most important decisions that the Legislature has had to make in decades. If politics are set aside, the right decision is obvious.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlelady from Texas. We stand with you and your colleagues here on the floor to continue to put pressure on leaders, not only in Texas but throughout the country, who do not see the value of expanding Medicaid.

I’m fortunate in Nevada—we have a Republican Governor, but he has agreed to provide the expansion for Medicaid, because he understands that in Nevada a third of our population is currently uninsured, and with the expansion of Medicaid that’s going to make sure that fewer people turn up in the emergency rooms through uncompensated care, which all of us as taxpayers end up paying for.

So this is an issue where Republicans who understand the bottom line in terms of health care and cost can work together with us to implement good policy for the American people. We’ll continue to work with Governors that have not seen the light, but we believe that this is a plan that will work very effectively.

Mr. Speaker, can I ask how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 18 minutes.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

At this time, I would like to turn to several of our new Members of the 113th Congress. I’m very pleased and honored to be serving with them. I’ve learned so much from all the Members here, but particularly have enjoyed getting to know the new Members of the Congressional Black Caucus. There are five new Members.

I would now like to recognize my good friend, the gentleman from New Jersey, the man with the great legacy, who’s carrying on the legacy of the late Congressman Payne, Representative PAYNE, Jr., at this time.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Let me first thank my colleagues, Congressman HORSFORD from Nevada

and Congressman JEFFRIES of New York, for anchoring tonight’s CBC’s Special Order on eliminating health disparities.

I would also be remiss if I did not acknowledge our leader on health issues in the Congressional Black Caucus, Dr. CHRISTENSEN.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to take the opportunity to acknowledge a young person on the floor, the gentlelady from Nevada, the young Miss Horsford, who is here tonight. This is truly unique quality time to spend with your daughter.

There are numerous factors that contribute to the growing health disparities in New Jersey’s 10th District—poverty, environmental threats, inadequate access to health care, and educational inequities. These issues are so interconnected that a piecemeal approach to fixing them just will not work. A comprehensive approach that focuses on providing access to quality care to all, creating good jobs that provide a decent living and increasing educational opportunities for low-income communities, is the only way to eliminate health disparities once and for all.

Even in the 21st century, health disparities are stark, especially in the African American community, in which life expectancies are lower and infant mortality rates are higher. Children of color who live at or below the poverty line are much more likely to have asthma, develop ADHD and contract diseases because they cannot afford vaccinations.

So we have a moral obligation to eliminate health disparities. Our children and our future generations are depending on us. But narrowing the health disparities that exist is not only good for our Nation’s health, it’s good for our Nation’s pocketbook.

Research tells us that access to quality health care could eliminate or reduce the onset of many chronic illnesses and disproportionate health outcomes that add to astronomical health care costs every year. Yet many of my colleagues won’t rest until they repeal ObamaCare. The fact is, the Affordable Care Act will now provide health care to 9 million African Americans who are uninsured or underinsured. ObamaCare ensures that everyone has access to lifesaving care such as preventative cancer screenings, as well as coverage for children with preexisting conditions.

□ 2020

We know that ObamaCare’s preventative services will help save lives and save money. So why are my Republican colleagues so set on repealing it? We have to protect ObamaCare just like we have to protect Medicare and Medicaid.

Sequestration is a direct attack on these already limited health resources. Sequestration is an irresponsible, across-the-board cut approach that will only contribute to the widening health disparity gap. Because of sequestration, Medicare has been cut by \$11 billion; cancer patients are being turned

away from clinics, and they cannot get access to the life-saving treatments they need to live; millions in funding have been cut from community health centers.

Furthermore, the effects are very real for the people in New Jersey. In my State, nearly 4,000 fewer children will receive vaccines for diseases such as measles, mumps, rubella, tetanus, whooping cough, influenza, and hepatitis B. There will be millions in cuts to grants that would help prevent and treat substance abuse. New Jersey will lose nearly \$4.9 million in environmental funding that ensures clean air and clean water.

We live in a first world country, and you want me to go back home and tell my constituents that we cannot provide them with clean water and clean air? This is absolute insanity.

And to make matters worse, the New Jersey State Department of Health and Senior Services will be forced to provide 19,000 fewer HIV tests to low-income communities. Sequestration is directly contributing to the spread of this fatal disease. In essence, it is providing a death sentence to those who are poor and who can't afford the testing.

So I say to my colleagues tonight: addressing health disparities in this country is both a moral obligation and a financial imperative. If we are going to truly eliminate disparities, we must start by eliminating sequestration, which does nothing but further the burden of our distressed citizens. Finally, we must maintain and strengthen our investments in health care access and resources for the disadvantaged populations that we serve.

In closing, just as Medicaid and Medicare and Social Security have become common threads and fibers of this great Nation, one day ObamaCare will be looked at in the same manner.

Mr. HORSFORD. Thank you very much to the gentleman from New Jersey.

I would like to now turn to the gentlelady from Ohio. She has come to Congress, providing great perspective as a member of the Financial Services Committee specifically, but also in her background of higher education and in her working on a number of these issues, one of which being the need to create a workforce that's trained and ready, particularly in the health care sector. I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Ohio, Congresswoman BEATTY.

Mrs. BEATTY. First, let me join my other colleagues in thanking my freshman class members, Mr. HORSFORD and Mr. JEFFRIES, for leading the Congressional Black Caucus' important discussion tonight on eliminating health disparities in America.

Tonight, you are hearing a lot of statistics because it is so important for us to let America know that low-income Americans, racial and ethnic minorities and other underserved populations often have a higher rate of disease and

fewer treatment options and reduced access to health care. So you will hear facts tonight.

The facts are that African Americans have the highest rate of high blood pressure of all population groups and tend to develop it earlier in life; African Americans are twice as likely to have diabetes than Whites; African Americans are twice as likely to die from stroke than Whites; African Americans are more than twice as likely to die from prostate cancer than White men; and African American women younger than 40 years of age are more likely to develop breast cancer than White women; infants born to Black women are 1.5 to 3 times more likely to die than those born to women of other races or ethnicities; African Americans are estimated to be 44 percent of all new HIV infections despite representing only 13 percent of the U.S. population.

These disparities are shocking, and the Congressional Black Caucus will not let us ignore them. In 2009, health disparities cost the United States economy \$82.2 billion. We have to continue to bring awareness to this issue within our communities and develop strategies to eliminate these disparities in a cost-effective way.

On March 23, 2010, President Obama signed the Affordable Care Act, which is a monumental step that helps us address these overwhelming statistics in health disparities within our communities. We now have in place comprehensive health care reform that improves access to affordable care and guarantees that millions of our most at-risk citizens will finally be able to receive care. By improving access to quality health care for all Americans, the Affordable Care Act actually reduces health disparities.

We share this information so citizens will know that this law invests in prevention and wellness, that it gives individuals and families more control over their own care, that it expands initiatives to increase racial and ethnic diversity in health care professionals by strengthening cultural competency training for all health providers, and that it improves communications between providers and patients.

As a lifelong health care advocate and as a stroke survivor and as an African American woman, I know the importance of protecting access to affordable health care coverage for all Americans, particularly for those who are most in need. We need to continue to move forward with this legislation and with initiatives that eliminate health disparities in America, and I look forward to continuing to work with all of my colleagues to improve our health care system. In order to have a successful Nation, we must have a healthy Nation. So this is my clarion call to all my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans—to help us make progress on this critical issue.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentlelady from Ohio.

At this time, I would like to turn to the gentleman from Texas, Congressman VEASEY, and I would like to thank him again for his hard work and contributions to this new 113th Congress.

Mr. VEASEY. Thank you.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from the Sagebrush State, STEVEN HORSFORD, and from the Empire State, HAKEEM JEFFRIES, for all of their work on this very important issue and also in talking about the importance of the Affordable Care Act and everything that it's going to bring to our country. I also want to talk about the health care crisis that is ongoing in America today.

Unfortunately, obesity and the long-term effects associated with this condition are all too prevalent in our country. When you look at the health statistics, it's quite astounding to say the least. Today in America, nearly two-thirds of adults and one in three children are overweight. In my own home State of Texas, we have one of the highest obesity rates in the country. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 30 percent or more of Texans are obese.

The high obesity rate has contributed to the pervasiveness of diabetes, heart disease, and other chronic diseases that drain resources from our health care system. Increases in food intake, a lack of physical activity, and environments that make nutritious choices more difficult have all played a role in this obesity epidemic.

Many children and adults do not have much control over the choices of foods they are able to get. Across this country, we are laden with food deserts or places where residents may not be able to get to a nutritious food option because they do not own a car or have access to public transportation, or maybe they don't live along walkable roads. This forces families to outsource their daily eating to more accessible and sometimes cheaper alternatives, such as fast food, to get their daily nutrients. A steady diet with high fat, salt- and sugar-based products has led to unhealthy lifestyles.

Diabetes is one of the more commonly known effects of being overweight or obese.

□ 2030

The disease affects 25.8 million Americans, roughly 8 percent of our population. The effects and complications of diabetes can include stroke, high blood pressure, blindness, kidney disease, and amputations.

Studies have shown that people with prediabetes who lose weight or increase their physical activity can prevent or delay type 2 diabetes and in some cases even return their blood glucose levels to normal.

Each of these statistics is more exacerbated when you look specifically at the minority population in our country such as Latinos and African Americans and our special-needs population.

When you break down obesity by race, African Americans have the highest rates of obesity at roughly over 35

percent; Latinos, a little over 28 percent as compared to the non-Hispanic White population of 23.7 percent. Individuals with disabilities also have higher rates of obesity at 31.2 percent. This is why I introduced House Resolution 195 designating May as Health and Fitness Month.

We need to correct our course as a country and get on the path to healthier lifestyles. The numbers are clear. We cannot sustain this unhealthy path we are on. Not only is it cutting the lives of too many Americans short, but it's also costing our country. In 2008, medical costs associated with diabetes were estimated to be at \$147 billion. The medical costs for people who were obese were over \$1,400 higher than those of normal weight.

We need to show our children that we can make healthy, nutritious choices and increase our physical activity. We must also not forget that this must be spread throughout all aspects of our population. While tremendous resources have been employed to help combat the growing obesity epidemic amongst children, markedly fewer have been used to address specific issues regarding how to best help obese children with disabilities.

So, today, let's declare a more nutritious and healthy lifestyle with better food choices and more active lives.

Mr. HORSFORD, thank you very much.

Mr. HORSFORD. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

I know we are wrapping up on our hour, Mr. Speaker.

I'd like to recognize the co-anchor for this hour, my good friend and colleague from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), who will provide a bit of a synopsis.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Thank you, Mr. HORSFORD, for once again co-anchoring this Special Order and for your tremendous leadership, and also thanks to Dr. CHRISTENSEN. We are thankful for all that you have done in chairing the CBC Brain Trust on Health Care.

The Affordable Care Act is the law of the land; the President has been elected and reelected; the Supreme Court has ruled it constitutional. Let's move forward and address the health care disparities that have been set forth so eloquently here today, come together and deal with the ailments that are facing the American people.

With that, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DESANTIS). Members are reminded not to refer to persons on the floor as guests of the House.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contributions of the Affordable Care Act to eliminating health disparities. Health disparities refer to the unequal health outcomes, ability to access health care, and rates of disease that impact certain Americans based on their income, race, ethnicity, or other identities. These disparities not only have devastating impacts on communities of color in my district, but they undermine health in historically marginalized communities across the Nation.

The disparities are staggering. For instance, in 2006, the infants of African American women had death rates over twice as high as infants of white American women. In 2009, the average American could expect to live 78.5 years, but the average African American could only expect to live to 74.5 years. African Americans also have significantly higher rates of hypertension and HIV than white Americans.

The impacts are financial as well as human. Eliminating health disparities would prevent approximately one million hospital stays per year, saving \$6.7 billion in health care costs alone. Even more stunning, from 2003 to 2006, the direct and indirect costs of racial and ethnic health disparities totaled \$1.24 trillion in the United States.

Insurance coverage is strongly related to better health outcomes, and African Americans have substantially higher uninsured rates than white Americans. Beginning in 2014, the Affordable Care Act will expand health insurance coverage to millions of Americans who are currently uninsured, and will provide subsidies to make coverage affordable for low-income Americans. The Affordable Care Act will mandate that Medicare and some private insurance plans cover essential preventive services at no additional cost, so that more people will be able to prevent illness and stay healthy.

The Affordable Care Act invests in community health centers, which offer primary health care to patients regardless of income, and in coordinated care measures, such as providing care teams to help patients manage chronic diseases and funding home visits for pregnant mothers and infants. Patients may be more likely to visit the doctor and receive quality care if physicians are able to understand their cultural background, so the Affordable Care Act also devotes resources to increasing the racial and ethnic diversity of health care providers and improving cultural competency training for all providers.

These are just some of the important ways in which the Affordable Care Act is working to eliminate health disparities. I look forward to collaborating with my colleagues to support the successful implementation of the Affordable Care Act and eliminate health disparities for future generations.

#### CURRENT EVENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it's always an honor to come to the floor of the House of Representatives, especially when there's so much of great importance occurring in our Nation at this time.

We do need health care reform, and I appreciate my friends across the aisle talking about the importance of good health care.

I've continued to hear people find that they are going to lose their health insurance. I was talking to numerous employers this past week who say, I want to compete and have been notified insurance is going up higher next year. I heard from a small business em-

ployer, I'm not going to be able to carry insurance. I love my employees. I provide them good insurance. But come January, too many of my competitors have said they can't afford to keep the insurance for their employees, and so they're going to drop it and pay the \$2,000 fine because \$2,000 is so much cheaper than the cost of health insurance.

The reason we were told for pushing through the ObamaCare bill in a very partisan way was because there were 30 million or so who did not have insurance; and as some have indicated, there may be that many who lose their insurance as a result of ObamaCare. So I'm very concerned.

I, like my friends across the aisle, want to make sure not that people have insurance necessarily, but that they have affordable health care. And I'm hearing from health care providers that they're hearing from people who are no longer going to carry insurance for their employees, that it's going to be more and more expensive to provide health care since they made money off those who had insurance; and without people having the insurance they had in the past, as the President promised and has been made very clear was not true, there will be more pressure on those who are paying for their health care to pay substantially more, which means there are more people who will not be able to afford it, and it will break the system. Of course, with health insurance companies complaining that because of the things they're forced to cover, their insurance is going to necessarily have to go up.

There will likely be insurance companies that will have to give up the health insurance business, and then the administration can complain that, Well, we thought we were going to be able to work with the greedy health insurance companies; but as it turns out, they've gone out of business and doctors have abandoned their practices and retired early. So it looks like the government is going to have to take over the health care business.

Under ObamaCare, the Federal Government is already going to have everybody's health records. Their most private and personal secrets between them and their health care provider will then be available to the Federal Government and, as I understand it, to General Electric, who this administration, because of their great support of General Electric in this administration and their cozy working relationship, they'll have the contract to take care of everybody's health care records. So that will be just delightful.

The tragic thing, just as the one lady asked during the town hall that the President had at the White House when she asked about her elderly mother getting a pacemaker, though she was of late years—I believe 95—and that she's had the pacemaker for 10 or 11 years, would the panel that decided who would get what treatment, would they consider the quality of life of an individual in determining whether or not

they get a pacemaker or such things, and the answer the President ultimately gave is, Well, let's face it. Maybe we're better off telling your mother that instead of a pacemaker you get a pain pill.

So it's very clear that as we approach the day when ObamaCare kicks in fully, there will be more and more seniors, whatever age this panel—it's not really a death panel—but it will decide who gets pacemakers and who is perhaps too old or maybe has lived a good life but now is beyond being worthy of, in this administration's opinion, getting a new knee or a new hip or back surgery, those kinds of things. You'll have bureaucrats that are deciding those issues all in the name of helping people with their health care. Because as anyone who seriously looks deeply into socialized medicine finds out, the only way for socialized medicine to stay afloat is if you have people dying while they're waiting on a list to get their particular procedures.

I mentioned on the floor, I believe last year, about a report from England that they're hoping to reduce the length of time that patients have to wait for their procedures, whether therapeutic or diagnostic, surgery, therapy, whatever it is, reduce that wait from the time it's prescribed until the time it's obtained down to 10 months.

□ 2040

Well, there are a lot of people that we know find out they have cancer, they have some problem, perhaps need a bypass, and if they don't get it immediately, then they don't make it for 10 months. So that's where we are headed and eventually people will see that, and I just hope and pray it's not too late so enough people will put pressure on their Members of Congress, and especially the Senate, to repeal ObamaCare and get us true health care reform so that people can have the health care that they want to have, they deserve to have. And for those who are truly—and only those who are truly—chronically ill or chronically poor and are not able to work or obtain affordable health care, then those people, as a caring society, we would take care of.

But since ObamaCare cut \$700 billion from Medicare, it's now appearing to more and more seniors that this administration effectively took money for treatment that they would get and provided that to young, healthier people who probably could, or possibly have their employer provide it if the employers were not being penalized for doing so, but whose employers will likely give up that insurance, and we'll see that as time goes on.

But nonetheless, seniors, although they were told by this administration and told by some people across the aisle that they wouldn't lose their doctor, well, many have already lost their doctor. People were told, if you like your insurance, you can keep it; and

we've already found that's not true. So my heart breaks for people who are going to need health care in the next few years and are simply not going to be allowed to have it because the government will stand between them and the health care they need.

I do recall seeing the President on video saying some years back that he wanted single payer health care, the government taking over all health care, but we couldn't get there in one step. As you examine ObamaCare and you see it is ultimately going to bankrupt health insurance companies, it is going to drive doctors out of the profession, it is going to ultimately bring down the standard of care, we see that it has now set up the whole system to fail so that down the road the government will say, just as then Senator Obama said, we will get to government-run health care because, gee, the greedy insurance companies went bankrupt trying to be greedy and doctors got out of the business, and now it looks like the government is going to have to take it over, just like we hoped.

If there was ever any aspect of life that would ensure that the Federal Government could dictate people's lives to them, it would be health care. When the government controls all health care, the government will control all people in this country because they will make the decision basically who gets what treatment, when we get to that point, and I'm hoping and praying we will repeal ObamaCare before that happens. It's going to require a new Senate, obviously.

Well, another area that has had a lot of government intrusion has been in the area of the First Amendment. So many people simply do not understand and do not appreciate that the First Amendment does say, "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof."

So we've had so many areas in which the government has moved forward to establish a nonreligion, has forced, like in the case of the major who shot and killed 13 of our servicemembers at Fort Hood, he and his Islamic faith were forced upon people who needed counseling about having to go, Christians who had to go to the Middle East, to Iraq, to Afghanistan, to serve their country. They had to get counseling from someone who made very clear that his faith was everything, and his faith in Islam so overwhelmed him that not only must it have affected the advice he gave to Christians who were forced to see him, but it also caused him to shoot and kill even those he had not wounded with his words.

But there does seem to be a war on Christianity in this country. Certainly, as the Founders anticipated, there should not be an establishment of religion, but most important was that they not prohibit the free exercise of religion.

When I was in the Army for 4 years, I had so many Christian friends. I had

friends that were not. But I had so many Christian friends, and it seemed that especially around east Texas, where I grew up, so many Christians, those that came from Christian backgrounds, also had instilled not only a faith in God but also a love of country because of just how blessed this country has been, and because they understood that since most of the Founders had this Christian faith and over half, about two-thirds were even ordained Christian ministers, the signers of the Declaration of Independence, they wanted freedom of religion. So you could be an atheist. You could be a Muslim. You could be a Buddhist, whatever. You could believe in the power of crystals and nothing else, whatever it was, because it was the Christian faith. If it is truly Christian, then it provides everyone with the freedom of choice, as God has given us.

There are other religions that do not give freedom of choice. And we know, as the Islamic countries, where we're not allowed, even as Members of Congress, to carry in a Bible or to talk about our faith at all, they clearly prohibit the free exercise of religion. Even since this country and so many thousands of Americans laid down their lives to bring freedom to Afghanistan, this country gave Afghanistan a constitution in which shari'a law was the law of the land, and the last report I saw indicated that the last Jewish person had left Afghanistan and the last Christian, public Christian church had closed. So there's no freedom of religion there. There's no freedom of religion even in allied nations like Saudi Arabia or even in Egypt, not complete freedom of worship, even when Egypt was more of an ally than a country that elected a Muslim Brotherhood member who wanted to see the great state of America destroyed.

□ 2050

This has been a country where anyone, any religious beliefs, would have freedom of religion. But when we get away from the Judeo-Christian faith, whose notions founded this country, then there is no protection for all religions.

So it was interesting to see, especially, having been in the Army, having had friends that made careers out of the military—so many that started with me stayed in for a career—to see, last week, that and, as this headline says, "Pentagon Confirms May Court Martial Soldiers Who Share Christian Faith."

This May 1st article by Ken Klukowski said:

The Pentagon has released a statement saying that soldiers could be prosecuted for promoting their faith: "Religious proselytization is not permitted within the Department of Defense. Court martials and nonjudicial punishments are decided on a case-by-case basis."

The statement, released to Fox News, follows a Breitbart News report on Obama administration Pentagon appointees meeting with anti-Christian extremist Mikey

Weinstein to develop court martial procedures to punish Christians in the military who express or share their faith.

(From our earlier report: Weinstein is the head of the Military Religious Freedom Foundation, and says Christians—including chaplains—sharing the gospel of Jesus Christ in the military are guilty of “treason” and of committing an act of “spiritual rape” as serious a crime as “sexual assault.” He also asserted that Christians sharing their faith in the military are “enemies of the Constitution.”)

Being convicted in a court martial means that a soldier has committed a crime under Federal military law. Punishment for a court martial can include imprisonment and being dishonorably discharged from the military.

So President Barack Obama’s civilian appointees who lead the Pentagon are confirming that the military will make it a crime—possibly resulting in imprisonment—for those in uniform to share their faith. This would include chaplains—military officers who are ordained clergymen of their faith (mostly Christian pastors or priests or Jewish rabbis)—whose duty, since the founding of the U.S. military under George Washington, is to teach their faith and minister to the spiritual needs of troops who come to them for counsel, instruction or comfort.

This regulation would severely limit expressions of faith in the military, even on a one-to-one basis between close friends. It could also effectively abolish the position of chaplain in the military, as it would not allow chaplains, or any servicemembers, for that matter, to say anything about their faith that others say led them to think they were being encouraged to make faith part of their life. It’s difficult to imagine how a member of the clergy could give spiritual counseling without saying anything that might be perceived in that fashion.

World magazine has an article entitled “Religious Battle Lines,” posted May 2, 2013. And in that article by Edward Lee Pitts, it says:

In a provocative piece at The Huffington Post written before his Pentagon visit, Weinstein, who served in the U.S. Air Force said, “We face incredibly well-funded gangs of fundamentalist Christian monsters who terrorize their fellow Americans by forcing their weaponized and twisted version of Christianity upon their helpless subordinates in our Nation’s Armed Forces.”

After the meeting, a column appeared in The Washington Post, largely sourced by Weinstein, which portrayed him as heroically taking on and lecturing the Pentagon brass. That piece in the newspaper’s On Faith section opened by suggesting that, while Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel has Pentagon budget concerns, “there are much more serious issues he must deal with. Religious proselytization and sexual assault are at the top of the list.”

Well, if Secretary Hagel were talking about the type of proselytization that has gone on among our military members that has caused anyone to yell “Allahu Akbar” and then go about killing fellow members of the service, then I would certainly understand why Secretary Hagel would be concerned about that kind of proselytizing.

But for anyone to talk about sedition and treason and Christians basically acting in an unconstitutional way by expressing or utilizing their freedom of religion, for him to promote the prohibition of the free exercise of religion, would be actually encouraging treason,

and it would be so very unconstitutional.

So it’s quite interesting, when you find people who are educated beyond their ability such that they could read the Constitution and not understand the second clause that does not allow prohibition of the free exercise of religion.

We got an explanation from DOD and the Air Force on what they really meant after people started objecting to this. And the Air Force statement said this:

When on duty, or in an official capacity, Air Force members are free to express their personal religious beliefs as long as it does not make others uncomfortable. Proselytizing (inducing someone to convert to one’s faith) goes over that line. Leaders must avoid the actual or apparent use of their position to promote their personal religious beliefs to their subordinates or to extend preferential treatment for any religion.

As this matter from Fox News says:

Lieutenant Colonel Tingley’s last sentence is troubling. An Air Force officer was told he could no longer keep a Bible on his desk because it “may” appear that he was condoning a particular religion. Air Force officers must be allowed to live out their faith in a way that is consistent with their faith. If the Bible is important, then an Air Force officer should be able to have one on his desk. Air Force officers should be allowed to attend chapel, lead prayers, even speak in chapel or lead Bible studies if it is consistent with their faith. This statement does not help. What does “as long as it does not make others uncomfortable” mean? Who decides? How much of this policy did Mikey Weinstein influence?

These are all good questions, because if the standard is that you may be allowed to express your religious beliefs unless it makes someone uncomfortable, then that is basically a prohibition of anybody’s freedom of religion, if they are a Christian.

Mr. Weinstein doesn’t seem to be bothered. I haven’t seen an expression of concern about anybody yelling “Allahu Akbar” and killing 13 other servicemembers as an expression of religion. He doesn’t seem to have found that treasonous or problematic. But some of the rest of us do.

□ 2100

So I hope that common sense and reason will win out, especially considering the historic nature of our Constitution. And those who parrot the words “separation of church and state” as if they are in the Constitution I find don’t often know that those are not in the Constitution and are not aware that Thomas Jefferson coined that phrase in a letter to the Danbury Baptists where he also coined the phrase, “wall of separation.” And this is a President who, it has been confirmed by secular and even the Congressional Research folks, that Jefferson most Sundays when he was here in Washington would normally ride a horse down Pennsylvania Avenue and attend a nondenominational Christian worship service here in the Capitol just down the Hall in what we now call Statuary

Hall but where they, back then, for most of the 1800s, had a Christian worship service.

The first woman to address a group in the Capitol did so, a female evangelist, a Christian evangelist spoke down the hall. The first Catholic to address a group in the Capitol did so just down the Hall. The first African American to address a group in the Capitol did so down the hall. It is a very historic place just down the hall where Church was held for most of the 1800s, a Christian, nondenominational worship service. So it is rather historic. And it was a Christian chapel to which George Washington went with all the other leaders after he was sworn in in 1789 and went down the road there in New York from the Federal building where he was sworn in to the chapel that was the only building at ground zero that was completely unaffected by the horrible fall of the World Trade Centers after they were attacked by people filled with hatred, an evil people, radical Islamists, who thought that in their religion, radical Islam, that they would find virgins in paradise by killing thousands of innocent people. So, hopefully, the military will take another look at this. I hope and pray they will.

For most of this country’s history, Members of Congress, even still we have Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle who quote Scripture from the Bible as a resource or a confirmation for a particular bill or position that they are taking. Going back to our very inception as a country, that was considered a wise thing and not a treasonous thing as Mr. Weinstein, so unfamiliar with our history, would attempt to have people believe.

It was the incredible Martin Luther King, Jr., an ordained Christian minister, that sought to apply the teachings of Jesus and the philosophy of Jesus through nonviolence to force the Constitution to be interpreted to mean exactly what it said, and that is the kind of basis from which there is legitimacy to treat all people equally. As Jefferson made clear, if people do not realize that their liberty comes from God, then they will not long keep that liberty. I think he said he trembled at such a thought.

This Wednesday, we are going to have a hearing in the Oversight Committee regarding what happened at Benghazi on 9/11 of last year. I will be honored, humbled and honored, to escort the widow of Ty Woods, one of the two former Navy SEALs who was killed when help did not come, for whatever reason, whoever ordered help not to come in a timely fashion, and this hearing will hopefully shed a little more light on that.

An article from Breitbart came out 5 May, 2013, by John Sexton. He says:

In an appearance on “Face the Nation” this morning, Representative Darrell Issa revealed several new pieces of information about the Obama administration’s controversial description of the 2012 terrorist attack in Benghazi, Libya, casting doubt that

the White House mischaracterized its cause by mere accident.

"The talking points were right and then the talking points were wrong," Issa explained in response to a question about reporting at the Weekly Standard. The CIA and Greg Hicks, who took over as Charge d'Affaires in Libya after the death of Ambassador Chris Stevens, both knew immediately that it was an attack, not a protest.

Hicks, who did not appear on the show but whose reactions were featured based on transcripts of interviews with Issa's committee, said he was stunned by what U.N. Ambassador Susan Rice claimed on five different news shows on September 16. When she appeared on "Face the Nation," she followed an interview with the President of Libya who claimed he had "no doubt" it was a terror attack. Moments later, Ambassador Rice contradicted him and claimed a spontaneous protest was more likely.

Acting Ambassador Hicks watched the Sunday shows and said he found this contradiction shocking. "The net impact of what has transpired is the spokesperson of the most powerful country in the world has basically said that the President of Libya is either a liar or doesn't know what he is talking about," he accused. Hicks added, "My jaw hit the floor as I watched this. I have never been as embarrassed in my life, in my career as on that day."

Hicks believes the stunning failure of diplomacy on the Sunday news shows explains why it took the FBI 3 weeks to gain access to the Benghazi site. The U.S. had effectively humiliated the Libyan President on national TV. That decision, he believed, probably compromised our ability to investigate and track down those responsible.

According to Hicks, no one from the State Department contacted him about what Ambassador Rice would be saying in advance. The next morning he called Beth Jones, Acting Assistant Secretary for Near East Affairs, and asked her why Ambassador Rice had made the statements she had. Jones responded, "I don't know."

A report published Friday by the Weekly Standard suggests that State Department spokesperson Victoria Nuland took issue with the initial talking points and, with backing from the White House, removed any evidence of al Qaeda involvement and of prior attacks on Western targets in the region. According to emails reviewed by the Weekly Standard, Nuland said her superiors were concerned about criticism from Congress.

□ 2110

You don't have to be trained in the Diplomatic Corps to understand that if the President of Libya, where our consulate was attacked, said this was not a protest, it was an attack by extremists, that since this administration needed his administration's assistance in investigating the matter, that they may have just alienated the President of Libya and negated efforts to bring the people responsible to justice.

Of course there's no real explanation as to why it would take 8 months just to put up three pictures, as has been done, to try to identify the perpetrators of what happened in Libya. Heck, when that was done regarding the perpetrators in Boston, it wasn't months that it took to identify those individuals; they precipitated bringing things to a head rather quickly. Isn't it interesting that it's only after tremendous congressional pressure to get to the

bottom of what actually happened at Benghazi so that we can try to avoid it for the future that all of a sudden there is interest in actually trying to capture the people responsible.

CBS News, May 6, by Sharyl Attkisson, has a headline of an article: Diplomat: U.S. Special Forces told "you can't go" to Benghazi during attacks:

The deputy of slain U.S. Ambassador Christopher Stevens has told congressional investigators that a team of Special Forces prepared to fly from Tripoli to Benghazi during the September 11, 2012, attacks was forbidden from doing so by U.S. Special Operations Command South Africa.

This is just shocking to think that we had people armed, equipped, able, as we know now if this is true, they should have been able to save the lives of those two heroes—Ty Woods and Glen Doherty—and also the State Department individual that had most of his right leg blown off up there with them. They could have saved all of them if they had been allowed to go protect the people who were sent there to serve by this administration.

Another article, the Washington Times has a headline: "U.S. could have halted Benghazi attack with a fly-over." This is according to a diplomat. This article by Shaun Waterman, dated Monday, May 6, 2013, says:

U.S. air power could have headed off at least part of last year's terror attack on the diplomatic post in Benghazi, but American officials never asked for overflight permission because there were no airborne tankers available to refuel, according to the House Oversight Committee's investigation.

Gregory N. Hicks, who became the chief of the U.S. mission when Ambassador J. Christopher Stevens was killed in the attack, told House investigators Libya would have given the U.S. permission to do the fly-over.

Democrats have accused the Republicans of running a "one-sided investigation."

Mr. Hicks will testify on Capitol Hill this week along with several others who will detail the conflicting stories the Obama administration told in the days after the attack, which left Stevens and three other Americans dead.

Mr. Hicks was deputy chief of mission at the embassy in Tripoli when the U.S. post in Benghazi was attacked by heavily armed extremists on September 11.

In interviews last month, Mr. Hicks told investigators with the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee that an overflight by a U.S. F15 or F16 might have prevented the second phase of the attack.

After the diplomatic post was over-run and set ablaze that night killing Stevens and Foreign Service Officer Sean Smith, the survivors took refuge in a nearby CIA building called the annex. That building was in turn attacked at dawn on September 12, when a mortar barrage killed former SEALs Glen Doherty and Tyrone Woods.

"If we had gotten clearance from the Libyan military for an American plane to fly over Libyan air space . . . if we had been able to scramble a fighter or aircraft or two over Benghazi as quickly as possible after the attack commenced, I believe there would not have been a mortar attack on the annex in the morning because I believe the Libyans would have split," Hicks told House investigators.

Another article from Fox News, also dated May 6, 2013, is titled: Clinton

Sought End-Run Around Counterterrorism Bureau on Night of Benghazi Attack, Witness Will Say at Hearing.

On the night of September 11, as the Obama administration scrambled to respond to the Benghazi terror attacks, then-Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and a key aid effectively tried to cut the Department's own Counterterrorism Bureau out of the chain of reporting and decision-making, according to a "whistle-blower" witness from that bureau who will soon testify to the charge before Congress, Fox News has learned. That witness is Mark I. Thompson, a former marine and now the deputy coordinator for operations in the agency's Counterterrorism Bureau.

It goes on down, it says:

Fox News has also learned that another official from the Counterterrorism Bureau—independently of Thompson—voiced the same complaint about Clinton and Under Secretary for Management Patrick Kennedy to trusted national security colleagues back in October.

Extremists linked to al Qaeda stormed the U.S. Consulate and a nearby annex on September 11 in a heavily armed and well-coordinated 8-hour assault that killed the U.S. ambassador to Libya, Chris Stevens, and three other Americans.

Thompson considers himself a whistle-blower whose account was suppressed by the official investigative panel that Clinton convened to review the episode, the Accountability Review Board. Thompson's lawyer, Joseph diGenova, a former U.S. attorney, has further alleged that his client has been subjected to threats and intimidation by as-yet-unnamed superiors at State, in advance of cooperation with Congress.

Down further it says:

"You should have seen what (Clinton) tried to do to us that night," the second official in State's Counterterrorism Bureau told colleagues back in October. Those comments would appear to be corroborated by Thompson's forthcoming testimony.

State Department spokeswoman Jen Psaki called the counterterrorism officials' allegations "100 percent false." A spokesman for Clinton said tersely that the charge is not true.

It says:

Daniel Benjamin, who ran the Department's Counterterrorism Bureau at the time, also put out a statement Monday morning strongly denying the charges.

"I ran the bureau then, and I can say now with certainty, as the former Coordinator for Counterterrorism, that this charge is simply untrue," he said. "Though I was out of the country on official travel at the time of the attack . . ."

And it goes on. But that seems to be the way, when this administration wants somebody to say, as he did, a charge is simply untrue and to strongly deny charges, they seem to have to call on somebody who had no firsthand information, which is why so many people were questioning why Ambassador Susan Rice was called upon to make the Sunday morning show round and constantly tell people that apparently it was the result of a protest and was not al Qaeda related, when in fact as people knew that night at the time of the attack, this was a coordinated effort. There was no sign of protest.

So the way the administration appears to have operated is to have people come forward who had no firsthand



information, give them their talking points, as Susan Rice was given—an intelligent person. She's told by people apparently she trusts, here's what you need to point out, here's what you need to know. And then those people have plausible deniability of what the real facts are because they've just been handed talking points.

So it is a very serious matter when we're trying to get to the truth because it does matter. It makes the difference between whether or not we learn from mistakes that were made and correct them for the future, or whether we refuse to learn from history, refuse to learn from the mistakes that were made so that we become, as the old saying says, destined to repeat them.

□ 2120

So it does matter, and it matters very much to Ty Woods' widow, who will be here for the hearing. She does have interest because it does matter to her.

What difference does it make? It will matter to the loved ones of those who will die in the future if we don't get down to what actually occurred, what mistakes were made so we can avoid them being made in the future. It makes a lot of difference to those who don't want their loved ones to die in the service of this country.

Now, there are also reports out there that, as I read already, that there was a group of Special Forces who were ordered to stand down and not go forward and help those at Benghazi. As the article from CBS News points out, there may have been a Special Forces team that was ready to go and then they were told you can't go. It is just incredible to think that someone may have given such an order and not allowed the military to go forward.

There are rumors afloat that people in the military, people in the State Department, have been told not to talk to Members of Congress about what happened at Benghazi. If there is anything to those accounts, one thing that is often helpful is to go to the law itself. 18 USC, section 1505 is entitled, "Obstruction of Proceedings Before Departments, Agencies, and Committees," and, in part, says: "Whoever corruptly"—and I'm just reading what might be applicable if this were ever to arise and someone ever were to instruct members of the military or members of the State Department or any agency of the Federal Government not to communicate with Members of Congress, this bears noting.

Whoever corruptly, or by threats or force, or by any threatening letter or communication influences, obstructs, or impedes or endeavors to influence, obstruct, or impede the due and proper administration of the law under which any pending proceeding is being had before any department or agency of the United States, or the due and proper exercise of the power of inquiry under which any inquiry or investigation is being had by either House, or any committee of either House or any joint committee of the Congress.

It goes on to say they'll be punished.

That's a rather serious matter, so hopefully nobody is out there giving such instruction or has not been out there giving such instructions, because when members of the military or the State Department or intelligence departments or Justice Departments have information and they have been asked to provide such information and anyone instructs them in any way that may impede Congress' recovery of such information, then they need to look at 18 USC.

Also, 18 USC, 371:

If two or more persons conspire either to commit any offense against the United States, or to defraud the United States, or any agency thereof in any manner or for any purpose, and one or more of such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each shall be—

And then it talks about their fine and imprisonment.

And then, of course, this under 18 USC, section 2:

Whoever commits an offense against the United States or aids, abets, counsels, commands, induces, or procures its commission is punishable as a principal. Whoever willfully causes an act to be done which if directly performed by him or another would be an offense against the United States, is punishable as a principal.

So, basically if somebody is encouraged not to be forthcoming or honest with the Congress, you run into some issues there as well.

I hope people will take note of our laws, and hopefully there's no truth to the rumors afloat that such instructions had been given because, just as I was so greatly offended when the national security letter system was abused and we had an inspector general report about that, I didn't care that it was a Republican administration that was abusing people's freedom and I spoke out.

And I hope that friends across the aisle, as this information continues to be forthcoming about misrepresentations that were made publicly by this administration, intentionally and knowingly, that others, friends across the aisle, will stand up, as I did, about the Bush administration, their Justice Department, and demand justice. I demanded a resignation from the FBI Director back then. We have an obligation, and it goes beyond party loyalty.

When people were killed who were sent to Libya to serve this country—and we had two former SEALs who went and gave their lives to try to save, and who did save, American lives—the least people stateside can do, the least those who were reportedly told you can't go help these people, the least they can do since they were not allowed, according to the story, not allowed to go give Ty and Glen backup then, I hope and pray they'll have the courage to give them backup now so there will be no more Tys and Glens that will have to give their lives in the future because inadequate security was provided and a State Department was stumbling through relations in a tough situation and then sent people forward

with statements that those who sent that person forward knew were not true, I hope that we'll have people, not just those that are now coming before the committee on Wednesday, but others, for the sake of Ty and Glen, Mr. Speaker, I hope people who are in the service or former servicemembers that may have personal information will give them the backup now that they're gone that they would have wanted if that was them who gave their lives.

Mr. Speaker, with that I yield back the balance of my time.

#### COMPREHENSIVE IMMIGRATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the privilege of being recognized here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and taking up the subject matter that I understand is going to begin this week with a markup in the United States Senate of a piece of legislation called Comprehensive Immigration Reform that has been advanced by the self-described Gang of Eight over in the Senate, four Democrats and four Republicans, a bill that they had dropped or introduced some couple of weeks ago, 844 pages all designed to solve the problem that we have here in the United States of illegal immigration and all the accommodations that have been made in efforts to, one, open our borders and open up our employment and open up our welfare systems and open up our public access to government services to people that are unlawfully present in the United States.

□ 2130

That's one side of the initiative. That's the CHUCK SCHUMER side, Mr. Speaker. Then on the other side are those of us who, instead, argue that the rule of law has to count for something, that you can't be a nation unless you have borders, and if you don't determine what comes across those borders, then you can't call yourself a nation.

I'd make the point that the most successful institution over the last couple of centuries has been the nation-state. Nation-states are formed around the lines of language and culture and national defense and civilization and economies. Language has been a primary component of it to which one can look at Western Europe, for example, and see where the lines are drawn around nation-states of common languages.

But here we are in the United States. We're a different kind of a country. We are a Nation that has been benefited by the legal immigration that has come into this country from every donor civilization on the planet. Because of the magnet of the image of the promise of God-given liberty and freedom, people



from all over the world have aspired to come to America to become an American, to take advantage of these opportunities of this God-given liberty in order to be able to start a business, to get a job, to save, to invest, and to establish and build the American Dream, the American Dream which is encompassed within this philosophy that each generation of Americans should have an opportunity greater than the previous generation's whether it's the whole generation of Americans in the current time or whether it is a generation of Americans growing up in a household of their generational predecessors—their parents. Each generation should have greater opportunity than the previous generation.

That's why our Founding Fathers, our forefathers—our predecessors—came here to this country. That's why they fought and defended God-given liberty and the American civilization across the continents and across the planet: to defend our American way of life. The freedom that we have, the liberty that we have, the free enterprise capitalism, the strong faith and family values, the language that binds us together, all of those components come forth to create this assimilation concept. We are the Nation that has been built on—some say “built by”—immigrants. This is a Nation built by immigrants. True. This is a Nation of immigrants. True, Mr. Speaker. So is every other nation. Every other nation on the planet is a nation of immigrants—people have moved there; they've lived there; they've developed there; their children have been born there; and they built the nation that they're in.

So we're not unique in the sense that we're a Nation of immigrants. We are unique in the sense that legal immigrants who come here can become American. They become American by embracing the American culture, American civilization, by understanding the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, by understanding the English language, by partaking in free enterprise capitalism, and by understanding that there is a uniqueness about being an American that gives us this vigor—this great vigor—that is an American vigor unique to the rest of the planet.

It is because of the God-given liberties that we have, many of them in the Bill of Rights: freedom of speech, religion and the press, freedom to peaceably assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances; the Second Amendment: the right to keep and bear arms; property rights in the Fifth Amendment; the right to be faced by your accusers in a court of law and be tried by a jury of your peers and no double jeopardy; the concept of federalism where the power is not specifically delegated to the Congress or to the President or to the judicial branch but devolved to the States or to the people respectively. Those are all pillars of American exceptionalism that make us a great, great Nation.

People around the world have seen that, and they've seen this American vigor and the magnet of the image. These concepts are all wrapped up in the image of the Statue of Liberty. Around the world, when people see the Statue of Liberty, they think, Well, that would be nice to live in a country like that or they think, I have to go there. I have to go there and find out what I'm made of. I think that I can develop and realize my potential in a place like America better than anywhere else in the world.

If you put out a beacon like that, if you put out the beacon of the Statue of Liberty and if that penetrates into countries all over the world, whether it be in Western Europe, Eastern Europe, across Asia, down through the Latin area, through the Middle East, to South America for that matter, to every continent on the planet, including Australia, but probably not so much Antarctica, people have come to America because they've wanted to realize their dreams within that rubric of the American Dream.

That's what makes this a special country, and that's why America could engage in global conflicts as far back as 1898 in the Spanish-American War, which took us over to the Philippines, or why America could engage in a conflict like World War I, when we went over to save as much as we could—and succeeded to a great degree—of Europe from the heavy hand of the Kaiser at a cost of a lot of American lives—of a lot of lives, let me say, on the western side of that line—and freedom was preserved again for another generation until World War II came along.

This was another challenge, and Americans rose up and met that challenge on two fronts. One of the pieces of wisdom about strategic warfighting is don't fight a two-front war. Well, America had to fight a two-front war in World War II. We had to fight our way back against Japanese imperialism across the Pacific, and we had to go to Europe and fight against the Nazis in World War II. That all happened simultaneously. Fighting a two-front war didn't work out so well for Hitler, but it did work out well for the United States—at a high price, but it worked out.

Because of that, the American influence washed across the globe, and the United States had the only major undestroyed industry in the world. Our dollar became the method of currency for the globe. American industry penetrated into every corner of the globe, and American know-how and ingenuity was established across this planet. That's because of those pillars of American exceptionalism that I talked about, and it's because of the American spirit of ingenuity, that spirit of ingenuity, which is a beneficiary of those willing legal immigrants who came here because they realized that they could achieve their dreams better here than anywhere else.

So the magnet of the American Dream has attracted the best and most

vigorous people on the planet to come here. That's the America I was born into, and that's the America that those of us who were born here inherited. Many immigrants have come since that period of time to contribute to this American Dream and to help redefine this American Dream and to make us stronger and make us better.

Now we've reached a time when the political thought in America seems to have lost its touch with rationality. We've watched as there has been a stronger movement on the part of the political machinery of the left, and we elected a President of the United States in 2008 that said to Joe, the plumber, Share the wealth. Share the wealth. You're making money. Give some of that to the guy that's not—not realizing that Joe, the plumber, needed all that he could earn and that he needed more opportunity than that, not less; thinking that the now President of the United States apparently believes, if you're in business, if you've invested some capital or some sweat equity or both, that somehow you're capitalizing on your customers who are viewed, I believe, by the White House as victims of that free enterprise system and that somehow you have achieved your success unjustly. The implication is that the entrepreneurs have collected the proceeds of the sweat of somebody else's brow rather than their own, have collected the proceeds of the sweat of somebody else's sweat equity, brain equity, creativity, innovation, work ethic rather than their own.

Truthfully, Mr. Speaker, any of us has the opportunity in this country to generate an idea. We have the opportunity to start a business. We have an opportunity to hire people to help us with that business, and we have an opportunity to buy, sell, trade, make, gain, and earn profit. The beauty of a free enterprise system is that, if someone is making too large of a margin, if their profits are excessive, we should have plenty of entrepreneurs who will see that as an opportunity and will generate a competing business that will go into that marketplace where there is a margin of profit that is high enough to attract that kind of investment, and they would take part of that profit out, and each one of those competitors that would materialize within that marketplace, the competition, would eventually take those prices down so that the profit margins of the entities that are making a lot of money would be reduced, not eliminated. We want them all to make money, but at the same time, the consumers benefit because the competition drives the prices down.

□ 2140

That's the concept of free enterprise. That's the concept of free enterprise capitalism. That's what Adam Smith wrote about so accurately and so succinctly when he wrote “The Wealth of Nations” and published it in 1776. It

has been a foundation of American thought and the American Dream. It has been a foundation of American enterprise and the foundation of America's economic system. And if one is taking the naturalization test and the question comes—there are little glossy flashcards on how you study this that USCIS puts out, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. You can pick it up and it will say, "Who is the Father of our country?" The answer is: George Washington. "Who emancipated the slaves?" The answer is Republican, Abraham Lincoln. That's just a little reminder there, Mr. Speaker, for the 10 percent or 12 percent of this population that seem to forget that.

Another question: "What's the economic system of the United States?" You snap that flashcard around and it says, "free enterprise capitalism." That's the foundation of our economy.

This economy has attracted people from all over the globe, and I recall that Professor Milton Friedman, one of the most respected economists in the history of not only the world, but the United States of America, a professor at the University of Chicago, a very well respected institution, made this statement:

An open borders policy is not compatible with a welfare State.

Here we are, Mr. Speaker, and we live in a welfare State, and we have an open borders policy. The welfare State and the open borders policy are being promoted, pushed and advocated by the President of the United States. The President who has—even though there was a minor little change made to welfare reform here on the floor of this Chamber in the mid-nineties. When the Republicans took the majority in 1994, the welfare reform came in 1995 or 1996, one of those 2 years, Bill Clinton, the President, at least twice vetoed welfare reform. "Welfare to work" was the mantra of the day.

There was only one component of welfare to work that actually was welfare to work. There are over 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs in the United States today. There is not a single person in America that can list you those welfare programs from memory, which should be a pretty strong indicator there's not a single person in the United States that could also tell you how those 80 different means-tested welfare programs will affect the way people act, whether it encourages them to go to work or encourages them to quit their job; whether it encourages them to get married or whether it encourages them to get a divorce; whether it encourages them to raise the children within the home, or whether it encourages them to not kick them out on the street, or horribly, potentially, get an abortion.

How do all of these 80 different means-tested welfare programs interact with each other and what is the net result of which direction our society goes? Let alone the question on each precious individual. How do they act

and react towards all these programs that are here? This is America. The huge magnet of the welfare state is attracting people to come to the United States to tap into the welfare system much differently than back in the day when people came here to have access to God-given liberty, that vision within the Statue of Liberty that just said to them, Come here. You can work. You can earn. You can save. You can invest. You can buy, sell, trade, make gain, and you can make do and you can make profit and you can make a fortune in the United States of America.

That message is now clouded. Sure, there's opportunity here, but the taxes and the regulations are higher, higher than they've been in a long time. And the taxes and regulation drain the energy off of the entrepreneurs at the same time that the welfare state is regulating and attracting people off of the work rolls onto the welfare rolls.

Years ago, Steve Moore, who is now one of the public commentators and a much published author—you'll see him on television a good number of times. He was with The Cato Institute at the time, I believe, and he was a founder and an original executive director of the Club for Growth. He said in words pretty close to this: People will do what you pay them to do.

If you pay them not to work, they won't work. If you pay them to stay home, they'll stay home. If you pay them if there's not a father in the home, there at least officially will not be a father in the home, although you'll have visitation going on, and you'll have more children. If you pay for them to have children at home without a father, that's what they will do. It's a logical thing for people to react to the negative incentives that come from government.

So with that foundation, Mr. Speaker, it was interesting for me to pick up the executive summary of the special report dated May 6, 2013. It's the Heritage Foundation report written by Robert Rector and Jason Richwine, Ph.D., and it's titled, "The Fiscal Cost of Unlawful Immigrants and Amnesty to the U.S. Taxpayer." Well, this may be the third time that Robert Rector and the people he's worked with will have saved America from a disaster.

Robert Rector was a central player in writing the language of "welfare to work" back in 1995 and 1996. He wrote it very tight, and he wrote it in such a way that it prohibited the President of the United States from suspending the work component of TANF, the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. The only component out of the 80 different means-tested programs that had actually required work, they made sure that an executive that wanted to give license to people to use the program but not follow the directive of Congress, the law, would be taken away, and that the President couldn't just simply by whim or executive order or edict violate the law and eliminate the work component to TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

But look what President Obama has done by his executive edict: he's suspended the only work component that existed that was in one of the 80 different means-tested Federal welfare programs, TANF, in violation directly of the specific statute that was written then.

Now, Robert Rector came back to us again in 2006 or so and wrote another report, and that's the report that told us about the cost of illegal immigration and what it meant to our society and our culture and our civilization. I believe that that report was instrumental in America waking up and coming to an understanding that there was a lot bigger equation than the simple buzz words of "we have to bring them out of the shadows, but what are you going to do about the 11 or 12 million that are here?" It's curious to me that number hasn't changed except has dropped by a million since 2006.

When I came to this Congress, I thought that the number of illegals in America was someplace in the neighborhood of 20 million, the judgement of those that we knew were here, plus a calculation of those that we knew were coming here, minus those that were going back home and those that are deceased. That came to a number that I thought approached 20 million people or more, and yet now we're hearing, in the time that I've been in Congress, more than a decade, 12 million illegals in America has now been reduced to 11 million illegals in America. All the while, the only thing that has changed in the dialogue of the left and the open borders people has been, Well, we can't deport—they used to say 12 million people. We can't line up all the buses and load up 12 million people. Now they've changed their dialogue.

Remember the people that were advocating that we needed to do something about man-caused global warming? They've changed their phrase now to be "man-caused," or else "climate change." "Global warming" has become "climate change." Twelve million people that couldn't be rounded up and put on buses now becomes 11 million people. What happened to that other million? Especially when we have a pretty good measure that they're coming across the border at a rate of something like 4 million a year. If that number has been reduced by half and maybe today it's 2 million people, that's still a lot of people. The cumulative effect of this population that's growing in the United States, it's not going down from 12 million; it has to be going up from 12 million. If it's not, we have a problem that's solving itself, Mr. Speaker. Yet, a pragmatic viewpoint is not going to be something that the people on the other side of this argument ascribe to because they have an agenda that's a little bit different than, I think, the practical application of what's good for the United States of America.

□ 2150

Robert Rector of the Heritage Foundation in his report that came out today, May 6, 2013, lays out some of these points economically. I can talk about the cultural, the constitutional, the rule of law part, but he lays them out economically. He makes these points in this executive summary, that there are four different ways that federally funded benefits are distributed.

One is in direct benefits. That's the form of Social Security, Medicare, unemployment insurance, and workers comp. That's the direct benefits component of it.

The second one is the means-tested welfare benefits, the 80 different Federal means-tested welfare benefits. That totals around \$900 billion a year in welfare. That provides cash for food, housing, medical, and other services. There's about 100 million people in the means-tested welfare system, and that could be Medicaid, food stamps, earned income tax credit, public housing, supplemental Social Security income, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families. That's the one work component that I talked about; President Obama has removed the work requirement. Now it's just another welfare program.

So there's two categories: direct benefits; the second category, means-tested welfare benefits.

The third category, public education, which is costing an average of about \$12,300 annually per pupil.

And the fourth benefit is population-based services, which include fire services, police services, parks, and those kinds of things that it takes for people to have a way to live in this society.

Of those four categories then, people use them, if they are legally here or illegally here, and often they will, the people who are here working here illegally will pay taxes. It's an honest thing. But they're also drawing down public benefits.

So if I would draw some numbers off of the Rector report, Mr. Speaker, the average household of an illegal household will draw down \$31,584 a year in public benefits. But if the household is headed by a college graduate, the difference is instead they will pay taxes and draw down some benefits, but they will have a net contribution of \$29,250 a year. Look at the difference; it's \$60,000-plus. The average dropout, a household headed by a high school dropout, without regard to their status, legal or illegal, they will have a net cost of \$35,113 a year. They'll pay in taxes, and they'll draw down benefits, and the average net cost to the taxpayer is \$35,113.

The average illegal household, however, and the average has a 10th grade education, the average household headed by someone who is unlawfully present in the United States, there'll be a net cost to the taxpayer of \$14,387. Now why is that so cheap? Well, it's because the law blocks access to many of these programs; and if and when they are legalized, they start to have access to these programs.

Now it's true that if you look at the proposal of the 844-page bill delivered by the Gang of Eight, the average illegal household during the interim phase of the kick-in over the next 13 years, actually they'll tap into the government a little bit less, about \$3,000 a year less than the \$14,387. It'll be \$11,455. That'll be the net cost per household. But once they are legalized, the average, I call it the post-interim household, will be drawing down a net cost of \$28,000 a year, and the average retirement cost is going to be \$22,700 a year.

So the current law, under current law, illegal households are a net cost to the taxpayer today, under current law, of \$54.5 billion a year—\$54.5 billion a year. If we go into an interim phase, if the bill in the Senate is passed, then it's going to be an annual cost—it's less, remember I said—of \$43.4 billion a year, and that's through that phase over the next 13 years. But after that, it legalizes a lot of people, around 33 million people according to NumbersUSA, and I'm not sure that's the number Rector is using, but it legalizes a lot more people, and they have access to a lot more public services, a lot more of that borrowed money from China that goes in to fund the welfare state that Milton Friedman talked about, and now after that interim phase, 13 years down the road, the post-interim phase, the net cost to the taxpayer—net—\$106 billion a year. And into the retirement phase for the same generation of them, the net cost to the taxpayer is \$160 billion a year.

So it boils down to this in the Heritage study that was released today, a lifetime summary, it's this: that those who are here today that are unlawfully present in the United States will be collecting \$9.4 trillion over their lifetime. They will pay \$3.1 trillion in taxes, and they'll have a net benefit of \$6.3 trillion as far as the collections that they would have from the taxpayer.

What nation in its right mind would go down a path like this and try to convince Americans that somehow this is an economic development situation?

I go to page 3 of the executive summary, Mr. Speaker, and Robert Rector makes this point:

At every stage of the life cycle, unlawful immigrants, on average, generate fiscal deficits (benefits exceed taxes). Unlawful immigrants, on average, are always tax consumers; they never once generate a "fiscal surplus" that can be used to pay for government benefits elsewhere in society. This situation obviously will get much worse after amnesty.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the bottom line on the Rector report. That's the economic analysis. I know that there is a competing analysis out there. I would submit that that competing analysis, which I've read, conflates the terms "legal" and "illegal," and it calculates the economic benefit but not the full cost. This study is a study that has been through the mill before. The principles that it was founded upon have

been analyzed before, have been tested before. And yes, there will be those who will seek to discredit this, but I would say to them, step back, take an objective look, and ask yourself the question: Even though you might believe that historically large numbers of legal immigrants coming into the United States have developed themselves economically and fit into the economic component of the United States, even though you might believe that—and I do believe that, Mr. Speaker. A hundred years ago, this country had a need for skilled and unskilled labor, an educated and uneducated workforce, but today it's a different world. Today it's a technological world. Today it requires an education. It requires technical skills.

We have a completely adequate supply of low and unskilled workforce. In fact, we have an oversupply of low and unskilled workforce. In every category that shows the highest levels of unemployment, we also see that those with the highest levels of unemployment are in the lowest and unskilled workforce. This isn't 1900. This is 2013. America needs educated people, talented people, people who contribute to the economy and pay a net increase in taxes over their lifetime so this economy can grow; and to take on the load of funding people who would come here without skills and without prospects of those skills is a foolish thing to do from an economic perspective.

There will be those who say maybe so, but the next generation will far surpass. This is a multigenerational investment, to which Robert Rector says, no; even if the second generation all graduated from college, if they all turned in this ability to have an average college surplus of \$29,250, they still could not pay back the deficit of \$6.3 trillion. And all of them are not going to go to college. About 13 percent will.

So that's a quick summary of the Rector study. I appreciate your attention and the privilege to address you here on the floor.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

January 6, 2013:

H.R. 41. An Act to temporarily increase the borrowing authority of the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out the National Flood Insurance Program.

January 29, 2013:

H.R. 152. An Act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013, to improve and streamline disaster assistance for Hurricane Sandy, and for other purposes.

February 4, 2013:

H.R. 325. An Act to ensure the complete and timely payment of the obligations of the United States Government until May 19, 2013, and for other purposes.

March 13, 2013:

H.R. 307. An Act to reauthorize certain programs under the Public Health Service Act

and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to public health security and all-hazards preparedness and response, and for other purposes.

March 26, 2013:

H.R. 933. An Act making consolidated appropriations and further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2013.

he had approved and signed bills of the Senate, of the following titles:

March 7, 2013:

S. 47. An Act to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

April 15, 2013:

S. 716. An Act to modify the requirements under the STOCK Act regarding online access to certain financial disclosure statements and related forms.

Mrs. WALORSKI (at the request of Mr. CANTOR) for today on account of flight delays.

## ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 7, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

## SENATE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

## EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2013 pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL TO ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 17 AND MAR. 20, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Chris Smith .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		2,140.00		2,048.00				4,188.00
Hon. Jeff Fortenberry .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		2,140.00		2,048.00				4,188.00
Hon. Robert Aderholt .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		2,140.00		2,048.00				4,188.00
Hon. James Langevin .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Hon. Anna Eshoo .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Hon. Loretta Sanchez .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		2,140.00		2,048.00				4,188.00
Hon. Rosa DeLauro .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		2,140.00		2,048.00				4,188.00
Rev. Patrick Conroy .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
David Schnittger .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Janice Robinson .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		2,140.00		2,048.00				4,188.00
Catlin O'Neill .....	3/17	3/20	Italy .....		3,261.00		2,048.00				5,309.00
Bridget Charville .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
David Adams .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Timothy Dupuis .....	3/18	3/20	Italy .....		1,558.00		2,048.00				3,606.00
Committee total .....					30,123.00		32,768.00				62,891.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Apr. 19, 2013

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL TO THE UNITED KINGDOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 16 AND APR. 18, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Marsha Blackburn .....	4/16	4/18	United Kingdom .....		1,104.00		1,181.00				2,285.00
Hon. Michele Bachmann .....	4/16	4/18	United Kingdom .....		1,104.00		1,181.00				2,285.00
Hon. George Holding .....	4/16	4/18	United Kingdom .....		1,104.00		1,181.00				2,285.00
Janice Robinson .....	4/16	4/18	United Kingdom .....		1,104.00		1,181.00				2,285.00
Committee total .....					4,416.00		4,724.00				9,140.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN, Apr. 25, 2013.

### REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Dan Benishek .....	1/25	1/26	Israel .....		498.00		( <sup>3</sup> )		1,724.08		2,222.08
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh .....		294.93		( <sup>3</sup> )		224.03		518.96
	1/27	2/2	India .....		1,982.18		( <sup>3</sup> )		1,904.26		3,886.44
	2/2	2/3	Portugal .....		278.00		( <sup>3</sup> )		469.75		747.75
Committee total .....					3,053.11				4,322.39		7,375.23

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. FRANK D. LUCAS, Chairman, Apr. 25, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Visit to Bahrain, January 27–February 1, 2013:											
Kevin Gates .....	1/28	2/1	Bahrain .....		1,188.72						1,188.72
Commercial transportation .....							10,106.20				10,106.20
Mark Lewis .....	1/28	2/1	Bahrain .....		1,188.72						1,188.72
Commercial transportation .....							10,106.20				10,106.20
Timothy McClees .....	1/28	2/1	Bahrain .....		1,188.72						1,188.72
Commercial transportation .....							10,106.20				10,106.20
Phillip MacNaughton .....	1/28	2/1	Bahrain .....		1,188.72						1,188.72
Commercial transportation .....							10,106.20				10,106.20
Delegate Expenses .....	1/28	2/1	Bahrain .....						716.18		716.18
Visit to Germany, Italy, Turkey, Israel, January 23–February 1, 2013:											
Hon. Rob Wittman .....	1/24	1/26	Germany .....		373.50						373.50
	1/26	1/28	Israel .....		996.00						996.00
	1/28	1/30	Turkey .....		408.03						408.03
	1/30	2/1	Italy .....		227.00						227.00
Hon. Hank Johnson .....	1/24	1/26	Germany .....		199.93						199.93
	1/26	1/28	Israel .....		888.88						888.88
	1/28	1/30	Turkey .....		195.62						195.62
	1/30	2/1	Italy .....		227.00						227.00
Michele Pearce .....	1/24	2/26	Germany .....		360.00						360.00
	1/26	1/28	Israel .....		996.00						996.00
	1/28	2/30	Turkey .....		408.03						408.03
	1/30	1/1	Italy .....		227.00						227.00
Vickie Plunkett .....	1/24	2/26	Germany .....		178.09						178.09
	1/26	1/28	Israel .....		807.75						807.75
	1/28	1/30	Turkey .....		278.03						278.03
	1/30	1/1	Italy .....		227.00						227.00
Ryan Crumpler .....	1/24	2/26	Germany .....		360.00						360.00
	1/26	1/28	Israel .....		996.00						996.00
	1/28	1/30	Turkey .....		408.03						408.03
	1/30	1/1	Italy .....		227.00						227.00
Delegation expenses .....	1/28	1/30	Turkey .....		1,201.75						1,201.75
Visit to Qatar, Bahrain, United Arab Emirates, January 27–February 1, 2013:											
Alexander Gallo .....	1/28	1/30	Qatar .....		679.65						679.65
	1/30	1/31	Bahrain .....								
	1/31	2/1	United Arab Emirates .....		728.69						728.69
Commercial transportation .....							21,022.00				21,022.00
Michael Casey .....	1/28	2/30	Qatar .....		679.65						679.65
	1/30	1/31	Bahrain .....								
	1/31	2/1	United Arab Emirates .....		728.69						728.69
Commercial transportation .....							24,689.40				24,689.40
Douglas Bush .....	1/28	1/30	Qatar .....		679.65						679.65
	1/30	1/31	Bahrain .....								
	1/31	2/1	United Arab Emirates .....		728.69						728.69
Commercial transportation .....							24,689.40				24,689.40
Leonor Tomero .....	1/28	1/30	Qatar .....		679.65						679.65
	1/30	1/31	Bahrain .....								
	1/31	2/1	United Arab Emirates .....		728.69						728.69
Commercial transportation .....							20,987.00				20,987.00
Delegation expenses .....	1/30	2/1	United Arab Emirates .....		625.26		106.56		713.81		1,445.63
Visit to Germany with Codel McCain, February 1–3, 2013:											
Hon. Michael Turner .....	2/1	2/3	Germany .....		1,258.39						1,258.39
Hon. Loretta Sanchez .....	2/1	2/3	Germany .....		953.51						953.51
Visit to England, Germany, February 17–22, 2013:											
Catherine McElroy .....	2/17	2/20	England .....		212.56						212.56
	2/20	2/22	Germany .....		78.56						78.56
Commercial transportation .....							2,473.80				2,473.80
Kimberly Shaw .....	2/17	2/20	England .....		236.00						236.00
	2/20	2/22	Germany .....		100.00						100.00
Commercial transportation .....							2,473.80				2,473.80
Stephen Kitay .....	2/17	2/20	England .....		212.56						212.56
	2/20	2/22	Germany .....		78.56						78.56
Commercial transportation .....							2,473.80				2,473.80
Timothy McClees .....	2/17	2/20	England .....		360.00						360.00
	2/20	2/22	Germany .....		226.00						226.00
Commercial transportation .....							2,473.80				2,473.80
Visit to Jordan, Iraq, February 14–20, 2013:											
Alexander Gallo .....	2/15	2/18	Jordan .....		608.92						608.92
	2/16	2/17	Iraq .....								
Commercial transportation .....							10,841.00				10,841.00
Michael Casey .....	2/15	2/18	Jordan .....		608.92						608.92
	2/16	2/17	Iraq .....								
Commercial transportation .....							18,841.00				18,841.00
Delegation expenses .....	2/15	2/27	Jordan .....				127.92		146.57		274.49
Visit to Afghanistan, United Arab Emirates, March 7–12, 2013:											
Hon. Howard P. “Buck” McKeon .....	3/8	3/10	Afghanistan .....		56.00						56.00
	3/10	3/12	United Arab Emirates .....		1,048.00						1,048.00
Commercial transportation .....							10,755.50				10,755.50
Hon. Duncan Hunter .....	3/8	3/10	Afghanistan .....		56.00						56.00
	3/10	3/12	United Arab Emirates .....		1,048.00						1,048.00
Commercial transportation .....									10,755.50		10,755.50
Hon. Paul Cook .....	3/8	3/10	Afghanistan .....		56.00						56.00
	3/10	3/12	United Arab Emirates .....		1,048.00						1,048.00
Commercial transportation .....									10,755.50		10,755.50
Robert L. Simmons, II .....	3/8	3/10	Afghanistan .....		56.00						56.00
	3/10	3/12	United Arab Emirates .....		1,048.00						1,048.00
Commercial transportation .....									10,755.50		10,755.50
Robert L. Simmons, II .....	3/8	3/10	Afghanistan .....		56.00						56.00
	3/10	3/12	United Arab Emirates .....		1,048.00						1,048.00
Commercial transportation .....									10,755.50		10,755.50
Delegation expenses .....	3/10	3/12	United Arab Emirates .....								
Committee total .....					31,658.12		163,624.28		56,344.35		251,626.75

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HOWARD P. “BUCK” McKEON, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Chris Van Hollen .....	2/18	2/20	Cuba .....		500.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				500.00
Commercial transportation .....							333.00				333.00
Committee total .....					500.00		333.00				833.00

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, Apr. 26, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Suzanne Bonamici .....	2/17	2/19	South Korea .....		633.52		<sup>3</sup> 13,537.00				14,170.52
Delegation expenses .....	2/17	2/19	South Korea .....					1,235.64			1,235.64
	2/19	2/19	Vietnam .....		555.77						555.77
Delegation expenses .....	2/19	2/21	Vietnam .....					568.62			568.62
	2/21	2/22	Cambodia .....		369.00						369.00
Delegation expenses .....	2/21	2/22	Cambodia .....					459.78			459.78
Committee total .....					1,558.29		13,537.00		2,264.04		17,359.33

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Transportation cost: inclusive of all countries visited.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, Apr. 24, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, Apr. 17, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Stevan Pearce .....	1/7	1/8	Republic of Korea .....		209.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				209.00
	1/8	1/9	Taiwan .....		266.29		( <sup>3</sup> )				266.29
	1/9	1/10	Thailand .....		167.89		( <sup>3</sup> )				167.89
	1/10	1/12	Ethiopia .....		826.44		( <sup>3</sup> )				826.44
	1/12	1/13	Rwanda .....		253.21		( <sup>3</sup> )				253.21
	1/13	1/14	Burkina Faso .....		198.60		( <sup>3</sup> )				198.60
Hon. Terri Sewell .....	2/18	2/19	Senegal .....		167.09		( <sup>3</sup> )				167.09
	2/18	2/18	Mali .....				( <sup>3</sup> )				
	2/19	2/22	South Africa .....		1,538.81		( <sup>3</sup> )				1,538.81
	2/23	2/24	Democratic Republic of the Congo .....		396.00		( <sup>3</sup> )				396.00
	2/24	2/25	Morocco .....		171.43		( <sup>3</sup> )				171.43
Committee total .....					4,194.76						4,194.76

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, Apr. 30, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013.

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>

## HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Chairman, Apr. 10, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Sheila Jackson Lee .....	2/16	2/19	Korea .....		316.76		19,969.70		1,235.64		21,522.10
	2/19	2/21	Vietnam .....		833.64				568.62		1,402.26
Hotel no show charge .....			Cambodia .....		142.00						142.00
	2/22	2/22	Germany .....						580.00		580.00
Committee total .....					1,292.40		19,969.70		2,384.26		23,646.36

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, Apr. 18, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Lale Mamaux .....	2/15	2/17	Israel .....		996.00						996.00
	2/18	2/20	Turkey .....		1,022.31						1,022.31
	2/21	2/23	Austria .....		1,170.70						1,170.70
Hon. James McGovern .....	2/18	2/20	Cuba .....		500.00		333.00				833.00
Committee total .....					3,689.01		333.00				4,022.01

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, Apr. 17, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Hon. Scott Tipton .....	1/25	1/26	Israel .....		498.00		( <sup>3</sup> )		1,724.08		2,222.08
	1/26	1/27	Bangladesh .....		294.93		( <sup>3</sup> )		224.93		518.96
	1/27	2/2	India .....		1,982.18		( <sup>3</sup> )		1,904.26		3,886.44
	2/2	2/3	Portugal .....		278.00		( <sup>3</sup> )		469.75		747.75
Committee total .....					3,053.11				4,323.02		7,375.23

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.<sup>3</sup> Military air transportation.

HON. SAM GRAVES, Chairman, Apr. 29, 2013.

## REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 2013

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem <sup>1</sup>		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency <sup>2</sup>
Allison Hollabaugh .....	1/26	2/1	Ukraine .....		1,243.40		2,462.30				3,705.70
Shelly Han .....	2/3	2/6	Austria .....		901.00		1,828.10				2,729.10
Paul Carter .....	2/15	2/20	Armenia .....		1,180.58		13,476.80				14,657.38
Janice Helwig .....	1/11	3/22	Austria .....		20,959.84		1,828.10				22,787.94
	3/15	3/19	Australia .....		1,697.00		11,506.20				13,203.20
Committee total .....					25,981.82		31,101.50				57,083.32

<sup>1</sup> Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.<sup>2</sup> If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Apr. 25, 2013.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1377. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Energy, transmitting a report on The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1378. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2012 Medicaid Integrity Program Report; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

1379. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-54, "Permanent Supportive Housing Application Stream-

lining Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1380. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-59, "Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Time Extension Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1381. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-60, "Egregious First-Time Sale to Minor Clarification Temporary Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1382. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting Transmittal of D.C. ACT 20-63, "Captive Earthquake Property Insurance Temporary

Amendment Act of 2013"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

1383. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting a status report on the Bureau of Prisons' compliance with the National Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1384. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report providing an estimate of the dollar amount of claims (together with related fees and expenses of witnesses) that, by reason of the acts or omissions of free clinic health professionals will be paid for in 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1385. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of



Justice, transmitting the Department's report detailing activities under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons Act during Fiscal Year 2012; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1386. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Revision of Maximum and Minimum Civil Penalties [Docket No.: PHMSA-2012-0257] (RIN: 2137-AE96) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1387. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Petitions for Rule-making (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0142 (HM-219)] (RIN: 2137-AE79) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1388. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Harmonization with the United Nations Recommendations on the Transport of Dangerous Goods: Model Regulations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and International Civil Aviation Organization Technical Instructions for the Safe Transport of Dangerous Goods by Air [Docket No.: PHMSA-2009-0126 (HM-215K)] (RIN: 2137-AE83) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1389. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel for Hazardous Materials Safety, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Miscellaneous Amendments (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2011-0138 (HM-218G)] (RIN: 2137-AE78) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1390. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2012-0803; Directorate Identifier 2011-NM-214-AD; Amendment 39-17419; AD 2013-08-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received May 2, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Ms. FOX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 198. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1406) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide compensatory time for employees in the private sector (Rept. 113-51). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. McDERMOTT):

H.R. 1827. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend through fiscal

year 2018 the authorization for certain health care workforce loan repayment programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COURTNEY (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TONKO, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 1828. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to extend public safety officers' death benefits to fire police officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Mr. BARR, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. STIVERS, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. LATTA):

H.R. 1829. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to provide guidance and clarification regarding issuing new and renewal permits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. CAPITO (for herself, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TIBERI):

H.R. 1830. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 1831. A bill to preserve the constitutional authority of Congress and ensure accountability and transparency in legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York (for himself and Mr. JONES):

H.R. 1832. A bill to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 1833. A bill to amend the Incentive Grants for Local Delinquency Prevention Programs under the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 to add gender-responsive services to the list of authorized grant purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1834. A bill to establish a bipartisan 21st Century Great Outdoors Commission to assess the use, value, job creation, and economic opportunities associated with the outdoor resources of the public lands and other land and water areas of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. LANCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. SCHIFF):

H.R. 1835. A bill to provide that service of the members of the organization known as the United States Cadet Nurse Corps during World War II constituted active military service for purposes of laws administered by

the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1836. A bill to enhance training and cooperation between law enforcement officers to respond to and prevent domestic violence and sexual assault in Indian country, to swiftly bring perpetrators to justice, to commission a GAO study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. HIMES, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. CHU, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 1837. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to clarify that fill material cannot be comprised of waste; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself and Mr. MORAN):

H.R. 1838. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to apply the Medicaid primary care payment rate to additional physician providers of primary care services; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1839. A bill to designate certain Federal land in the San Juan National Forest in the State of Colorado as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. TSONGAS (for herself and Mr. NEAL):

H.R. 1840. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from income and employment taxes real property tax abatements for seniors and disabled individuals in exchange for services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1841. A bill to provide for an earlier start for State health care coverage innovation waivers under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H. Res. 197. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that supporting seniors and individuals with disabilities is an important responsibility of the

United States, and that a comprehensive approach to expanding and supporting a strong home care workforce and making long-term services and supports affordable and accessible in communities is necessary to uphold the right of seniors and individuals with disabilities in the United States to a dignified quality of life; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MCCOLLUM (for herself, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. RANGEL):

H. Res. 199. A resolution expressing support for designation of May 2013 as "National Celiac Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. MENG (for herself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 200. A resolution reaffirming the United States' commitment to the economic and military security of the Republic of Korea and expressing the shared vision of the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of Korea for a prosperous and peaceful Asian community on the occasion of the 60th anniversary of the Mutual Defense Treaty between the United States and the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. COBLE, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HANNA, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GERLACH, Ms. MOORE, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HOLT, Ms. CHU, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. FALCONE, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois):

H. Res. 201. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Nurses Week on May 6, 2013, through May 12, 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1827.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1. The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H.R. 1828.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: The Congress shall have Power to Lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and

provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States. . . .

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1829.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically Clause 3 (related to regulation of Commerce among the States).

By Mrs. CAPITO:

H.R. 1830.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 1 and Article I Section 8 Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BENTIVOLIO:

H.R. 1831.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) Article I, section 5, clauses 2 and 3 to determine the rules and to keep a journal of its proceedings, respectively;

(2) Article I, section 7, clause 2 to ensure that bills that become law have been actually passed by, not just passed through, each House of Congress; and

(3) Article I, section 8, clause 18, which authorizes Congress to make all laws that are necessary and proper for carrying into execution the rules of each House.

Furthermore, the provision of this Act under which any person who is aggrieved by the enforcement of any law enacted either in violation of the rules of proceedings of either House of Congress, or by the suspension of such rules, as prescribed herein, shall have standing in a court of law, is pursuant to article III, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BISHOP of New York:

H.R. 1832.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 1833.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5

Section 1: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

\*\*\*\*

Section 5: The Congress shall have power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this article.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 1834.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 1835.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 1836.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 1837.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 1838.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, Clause I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 1839.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I. Section 8 of the United States Constitution: to make rules for the government and regulation of land.

By Ms. TSONGAS:

H.R. 1840.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Amendment XVI to the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 1841.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3: Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RADEL, Mr. MEADOWS, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 38: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 45: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 96: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 97: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 137: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 138: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 141: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 142: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 148: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 164: Mr. LANCE and Mr. HULTGREN.

H.R. 180: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 182: Mr. LOEBACK.

H.R. 184: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 226: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 236: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 241: Mr. BARBER.

H.R. 262: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 271: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 288: Mr. BARBER and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 303: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 324: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 351: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BONNER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 366: Ms. CHU, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MENG, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 376: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 437: Mr. CAPUANO and Ms. CLARKE.

H.R. 440: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 451: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 485: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 501: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 503: Mr. O'ROURKE and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
H.R. 508: Ms. NORTON and Mr. CONYERS.  
H.R. 521: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 543: Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H.R. 544: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. YOH0, and Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 556: Mr. WENSTRUP and Mr. POSEY.  
H.R. 567: Mr. CHAFFETZ.  
H.R. 578: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.  
H.R. 630: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. VARGAS, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 671: Mr. LIPINSKI and Ms. ZOE LOFGREN.  
H.R. 685: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.  
H.R. 686: Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 689: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 693: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 698: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 720: Mr. MARKEY.  
H.R. 724: Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.  
H.R. 735: Mr. BARBER.  
H.R. 755: Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. ROYCE.  
H.R. 769: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. WALZ.  
H.R. 776: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 777: Mrs. LUMMIS.  
H.R. 792: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 800: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 801: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 811: Mr. RUNYAN and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 826: Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 847: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Ms. CHU.  
H.R. 850: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. MORRIS RODGERS, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. HONDA.  
H.R. 851: Ms. PINGREE of Maine.  
H.R. 904: Mr. DUFFY.  
H.R. 920: Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 924: Ms. MENG and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 929: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 940: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. COTTON.  
H.R. 949: Mr. POCAN and Mr. PAYNE.  
H.R. 950: Mr. WITTMAN.  
H.R. 961: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. OWENS.  
H.R. 1008: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 1020: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. JORDAN.  
H.R. 1024: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. DUFFY.  
H.R. 1026: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. KLINE, and Mrs. BUSTOS.  
H.R. 1038: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1041: Mr. POLIS and Ms. WILSON of Florida.  
H.R. 1093: Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 1097: Mr. SESSIONS.  
H.R. 1102: Mrs. LOWEY.  
H.R. 1130: Mr. MESSER.  
H.R. 1140: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.  
H.R. 1146: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.  
H.R. 1151: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 1155: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. CRAWFORD, and Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 1171: Mr. COTTON.  
H.R. 1179: Mr. GIBSON, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. RIBBLE.  
H.R. 1186: Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS, and Mr. KINGSTON.  
H.R. 1209: Mr. STUTZMAN.  
H.R. 1221: Mr. RAHALL and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.  
H.R. 1243: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 1249: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 1250: Mr. POLIS and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 1255: Mr. SCHOCK and Mr. AMODEI.  
H.R. 1281: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 1286: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 1290: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 1331: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.  
H.R. 1346: Ms. BASS.  
H.R. 1355: Mr. MULVANEY.  
H.R. 1384: Mr. FARR.  
H.R. 1387: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 1395: Mr. DEUTCH.  
H.R. 1414: Ms. HAHN, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1424: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 1428: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H.R. 1432: Mr. HIMES and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H.R. 1449: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COLE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1475: Mr. RIBBLE.  
H.R. 1481: Mr. BARLETTA.  
H.R. 1482: Mr. COTTON.  
H.R. 1485: Mr. BOUSTANY and Mr. MILLER of Florida.  
H.R. 1488: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1494: Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 1502: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 1507: Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H.R. 1518: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WELCH, Mr. YOH0, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. ANDREWS.  
H.R. 1528: Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GUTHRIE, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.  
H.R. 1531: Ms. HAHN.  
H.R. 1547: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.  
H.R. 1551: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KINGSTON, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, and Mr. GUTHRIE.  
H.R. 1552: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. PITTS.  
H.R. 1553: Ms. JENKINS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. OLSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. COOPER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, and Mr. KLINE.  
H.R. 1565: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, and Ms. SCHWARTZ.  
H.R. 1572: Mr. GRIFFIN of Arkansas and Mr. COTTON.  
H.R. 1594: Mr. KINGSTON.  
H.R. 1595: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York and Ms. MENG.  
H.R. 1598: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 1601: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 1613: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. MEADOWS.  
H.R. 1620: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.  
H.R. 1623: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK and Mr. RAHALL.  
H.R. 1626: Mr. ROSS.  
H.R. 1652: Ms. HANABUSA and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 1667: Mr. MORAN and Mr. DEFazio.  
H.R. 1692: Mrs. SLAUGHTER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1693: Mr. HUELSKAMP.  
H.R. 1699: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. HOLT.  
H.R. 1701: Mr. HARRIS.  
H.R. 1705: Mr. JONES, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. HUNTER.  
H.R. 1708: Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROKITA, and Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 1717: Mr. LONG, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BARROW of Georgia, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FORBES, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. LANCE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, and Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
H.R. 1723: Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1727: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. MORAN, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 1730: Mr. COHEN.  
H.R. 1735: Mr. CULBERSON and Mr. HUELSKAMP.  
H.R. 1736: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
H.R. 1737: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. COLE.  
H.R. 1752: Mr. COTTON.  
H.R. 1755: Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. ESTY, and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1763: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. ELLISON.  
H.R. 1764: Mr. GINGREY of Georgia, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. SALMON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 1781: Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
H.R. 1795: Mr. HANNA, Ms. HAHN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. PINGREE of Maine, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. MICHAUD, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1796: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. HAHN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. LOEBSACK.  
H.R. 1801: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAURO, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
H. Con. Res. 4: Mr. KING of New York.  
H. Con. Res. 29: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. COTTON. A 59  
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. SABLAN.  
H. Res. 24: Mr. SALMON.  
H. Res. 36: Mr. SALMON, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SOUTHERLAND, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. CASSIDY.  
H. Res. 72: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.  
H. Res. 109: Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.  
H. Res. 123: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. ENYART.  
H. Res. 156: Ms. HAHN and Mr. VEASEY.  
H. Res. 167: Ms. HAHN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BRALEY of Iowa.  
H. Res. 173: Mr. MEADOWS.  
H. Res. 174: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS of Michigan, Mr. FARR, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. SIRES, Mr. WALZ, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. NEAL, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. DOYLE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. PETERS of California, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
H. Res. 182: Mr. BUCHANAN and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
H. Res. 190: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FALOMAVEGA, Ms.

*May 6, 2013*

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

**H2439**

SINEMA, Mr. GRIMM, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. H. Res. 191: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. WILSON of Florida. H. Res. 196: Mr. WATT.